

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.



Tuesday, the 13th May 1952.

The House met in the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at eleven of the clock, Mr. Chairman (THE HON. DR. P. V. CHERIAN) in the Chair.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

I.—CONDOLENCE RESOLUTION *RE* THE DEATH OF DR. U. RAMA RAO.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ Hon. Members might have heard about the sad demise of Dr. U. Rama Rao. I have received notice of a resolution from Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari, Leader of the House, in that connexion. The Hon. the Leader of the House may move the Resolution.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is a very sad duty that we have to perform on this occasion. We all knew that our ex-Chairman of this Council, or as he was then called the President of the Council, was old, but we did not expect that he would pass away in this sudden manner. He was beloved of all the people of Madras. He was beloved of all the Members of this Council and the Assembly for many, many years past. He performed his duties as President of the Council in such a way as to create no friction or difficulties. Everybody respected and honoured him. As regards the services rendered by him to society in general and to sick people in particular, I need hardly repeat what has already been said by many and what has been written by many. He was specially beloved because of his great gentlemanliness, accessibility, frankness and readiness to serve on all occasions. He was a self-made man. He began life humbly and lived a rich life and when he passed away he deservedly met his death in a peaceful and happy manner. He hardly knew and his family hardly knew that he would pass away in the early hours of the morning of yesterday. He had hardly any pain or any sickness previous to that. Now, such a death would be the envy of everyone who valued things according to their proper values. In particular, Sir, this House owes it to him and his memory that we should record our appreciation of all his services to society and to the people who required the services of the profession to which he belonged. We must specially record our appreciation of his services in the Council. I need not say all that I have said in another place. I am sure other hon. Members who will follow me will refer in detail to all that he did for the public. I move that the following Resolution be adopted by the House :—

‘ That this House places on record its deep sense of sorrow at the demise of Dr. U. Rama Rao, a former distinguished President of this Council and a Member of the Legislature for many years and conveys its sense of sympathy to the members of the bereaved family .’”

[13th May 1952]

* SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is my painful privilege to associate myself with the Resolution just now moved by the Hon. Chief Minister. Dr. Rama Rao died full of years and honours. I have known him for a pretty long time. Long before he became associated with the politics of this State, he played a very memorable role in the Corporation of Madras in those days when there was an official President who was also the Commissioner of the Corporation. I remember the many memorable fights in which he took part along with the late Dr. Nair. Both of them were redoubtable fighters for various rights that the Corporation wanted in those days, and which were stoutly resisted by the then official party in the Corporation. Besides this, he came to public life and played a very humble, but at the same time a very important role in politics. He was associated with every movement started for the betterment of the political and social conditions of our people. I should like to say that the end of a righteous man, as the Bible puts it, is something to be observed. As the Hon. Chief Minister pointed out, Dr. Rama Rao had a happy end. He usefully spent his life after retirement. I used to meet him occasionally when he used to go out for a walk, and he was always kind and he used to ask me, how I was getting on. He lived not only a long and laborious life, but at the same time, he lived to see his beloved son, Dr. U. Krishna Rao occupying the Mayoral Chair of the Corporation of Madras, and during the last one month, becoming a Member of the Council of Ministers of this State. I wish to convey, along with other hon. Members of this House, through you, Sir, my feelings of sympathy and my sincere condolences to the members of the bereaved family.”

* JANAB MAHOMED USMAN :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to associate myself with the Resolution that has been so ably moved by the Hon. Chief Minister. Dr. Rama Rao was the President of the Council for about 2½ years or so. I think that when the Council was inaugurated in 1937, I was the temporary President. At that time, I remember that Dr. Rama Rao was elected permanent President of the Council. I very well remember the very dignified way in which he conducted the proceedings of the Council. As has been pointed out by the Hon. Chief Minister, Dr. Rama Rao was a good doctor and he was always kind to the poor people. He was a great gentleman. He has many friends and I do not think that there can be anybody who can be called his enemy. It is a matter of great regret and sorrow that such a good man has passed away. I am sure that the resolution that we are passing will give a certain amount of consolation to Dr. Krishna Rao and his family. As was rightly said by my Friend, Sri Chakkarai Chettiar, it is a matter for satisfaction that God has allowed him to see his son, Dr. Krishna Rao, become a Minister of this State. I associate myself with the sentiments expressed in the Resolution so ably moved by the Hon. Chief Minister.”

DR. C. NATHAMUNI NAIDU :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is with feelings of profound sorrow that I get up to associate myself

13th May 1952] [Dr. C. Nathamuni Naidu]

with the sentiments expressed by the previous speakers on the sad and sudden demise of a veteran medical man in the City of Madras. He was the organiser of the St. John's Ambulance Brigade in the City of Madras and many men have taken their training in first aid from him. I wish to bring to the notice of the hon. Members of this House that he belonged to a class of medical men who formed the backbone of the medical profession. He was one of those medical men who fought very hard in those days to bring in a uniform standard of medical education. There was the dual system of medical education. He fought hard and he impressed upon the then Health Minister, Dr. T. S. S. Rajan, the need for having a uniform standard of education. Dr. Rajan consequently introduced a very good reform in medical education. Dr. Rama Rao said that the Licentiate course should either be ended or mended. Dr. Rajan took the advice of Dr. Rama Rao and other medical men in this matter and ended that Licentiate course. That is why we have to-day only one system of medical education, namely, the Degree Course. I should say that the whole credit for this should go to the late lamented Dr. Rama Rao. He has left a very good tradition in this House. I am glad that you, Sir, are occupying this Chair, as a second medical man. Dr. Rama Rao, during his Presidentship of the Council had set up a very good tradition, which could very well be followed by those who occupy the Chair.

"As regards his love for the City, he evinced keen interest in the civic administration of the City of Madras and I think he served on the Madras Corporation for 2 or 3 years. In the death of Dr. Rama Rao, we have lost a very good patron and a veteran Congressman. I saw him just a month back. I cannot describe, Gentlemen, in words, the zeal with which he was expressing to me that the Congress should form the Government in this State under the able leadership of Sri Rajaji. I am glad that his idea has been fulfilled. I am also glad that Dr. Rama Rao died only after seeing his son occupying a place in the Council of Ministers under Rajaji's leadership in this State. I once again associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Chief Minister. I pray that Almighty may be pleased to keep his soul in peace. Thank you, Sir."

* MRS. M. N. CLUBWALA :—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, on behalf of the women of the St. John Ambulance Nursus' Corps, I would like to associate myself with the Resolution before the House expressing sorrow and sympathy at the passing away of Dr. Rama Rao. Sir, it was at his instance that voluntary lady workers came together for nursing work in hospitals. He always encouraged the nursing profession especially in the old days when it was not the habit for Indian ladies to come forward and do nursing. Right from those early times, he took a great interest in the profession and encouraged younger people to do their bit for the country in other fields of work. On behalf of the women volunteers, I associate myself with the resolution and convey my deep sympathy to the members of his family."

11-15
a.m.

[13th May 1952]

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, on behalf of the Opposition, I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the Hon. the Leader of the House. Dr. U. Rama Rao was well-known to the older Members of the House. He was a distinguished surgeon and he was keenly interested in the advancement of the medical profession. He was known to the world outside the medical profession, as a fighter in the cause of freedom. In Madras City, he and Mr. T. Prakasam, were responsible to a great extent for the great freedom struggle which was waged in the last three decades. He was generous-hearted and no Congress worker who went to him ever returned empty-handed.

“ Sir, as President of the first Legislative Council constituted under the Government of India Act, 1935, he did great service in establishing good precedents and he is known to have moved well with the Members. There was no case of friction between him and any Member whether of the Government or of the Opposition. I, therefore, associate myself with the Resolution and would like to express my deep sense of sorrow at the unhappy event.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I would like to associate myself very closely with the Resolution of Condolence moved by the Hon. the Leader of the House. Dr. Rama Rao's name was a household word in Madras City and I still remember when I came to Madras as a young medical student in 1912, Dr. Rama Rao was already famous as a doctor. He started life humbly and from a small beginning, he had been able to establish a very big reputation for himself and his family. Young medical men always looked up to him for help and advice which were always given without stint. To me personally he had been of very great help both professionally and otherwise. As the Hon. the Leader of the House said, nobody could wish for a better form of death than passing away without any pain and very quietly. He had the great privilege and satisfaction of living long to realise the highest ambition of seeing one of his sons as a Minister of this Government and another son enjoying very great reputation as one of the finest surgeons not only in India but outside. With these words, I associate the Chair with the Resolution before the House.

“ The Resolution is—

‘ That this House places on record its deep sense of sorrow at the demise of Dr. U. Rama Rao, a former distinguished President of this Council, and a Member of the Legislature for many years and conveys its sense of sympathy to the members of the bereaved family ’.”

The Resolution was carried *nem. con.* all the Members standing.

II.—CHANGE IN THE ORDER OF BUSINESS.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Order Paper mentions the Motion that I have given notice of as the next item to be taken up. It would be more convenient to all concerned if the discussion on the Governor's Address is continued uninterrupted? I suggest we might perhaps close it before lunch time and then my Motion may be taken up.”

13th May 1952]

SRI M. P. GOVINDA MENON :—“ Apart from the suggestion of the Hon. the Leader of the House, under Rule 6 of the Council Rules, the discussion on the Governor's Address ' shall last till such time as the Chairman may consider necessary and shall have precedence over other business of the House except business of a formal or ceremonial nature '. So, Sir, the Chairman's hands are fettered and he has no discretion to deviate from the Rules governing the conduct of business in the House. On a point of order, therefore, I say that the discussion on the Address may be continued before the other Motion is taken up.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I am quite willing that it may be taken that the change in the order of business is made at the instance of the last speaker himself and not at my instance. (Laughter.)

* **SRI S. B. ADITYAN** :—“ I want to raise a point of procedure. You are aware, Sir, of Rule 22 (3) which says that the order of business, as arranged in the list, shall not be revised except on a Motion accepted by the House. We have already had the agenda and all that I say is that a formal Motion be moved. We have agreed to a change in the order of business. When we do so, let us do it in the proper way prescribed by the Rules. I would request the Hon. the Leader of the House to make a formal Motion which will be formally accepted by the House.”

* **THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI** :—“ I am sorry, Sir, we are needlessly prolonging the discussion. I made the suggestion to the Chairman and it was about to be accepted when an hon. Member on the other side raised a point of order and I yielded to him. I said, let it be discussed in the order mentioned originally and so no question arises of a motion now.”

III.—PANEL OF CHAIRMEN.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I have to announce to the House that under rule 15 of the Madras Council Rules, I have nominated the following four Members of the Council to be the panel of Chairmen for the first session of the Legislative Council under the new Constitution :—

- 1 Sri K. Bhashyam.
- 2 Srimathi S. Manjubhashini.
- 3 Srimathi J. Sita Mahalaxmi.
- 4 Dr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty.”

IV.—DISCUSSION ON HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS—cont.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The House will now continue the discussion of the Governor's Address.”

* **SRIMATHI J. SITA MAHALAXMI** :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the previous speakers who supported the motion of Thanks to His

[Srimathi J. Sita Mahalaxmi]

[13th May 1952]

Excellency the Governor for his Address and request you, Sir, to convey to His Excellency our hearty thanks for the Address he has delivered.

"The most important item of work which His Excellency's Government have undertaken is to alleviate the distress of the people in the famine-stricken places of the State and the work they have done is highly commendable. His Excellency's sympathy towards the people of such areas is a great solace to us and I am sure that His Excellency's Government will bestow their attention to improve the irrigation works and open up new projects in order to prevent the occurrence of famine again and again. In this connection, I would like to bring to the notice of the Government that there are many irrigation projects which are minor in size and which can be taken up in Rayalaseema and other places where famine conditions exist. For instance, there are the Vamsadhara project in Visakhapatnam, the Eleru project in East Godavari district and the Tammileru project in West Godavari district, which can be taken up immediately without waiting for any loan or grant from outside. The Government say they want funds. With great respect, I would suggest that the projects I have mentioned will not cost much and that the Government can find ways and means to execute them. These projects, if executed, will help the ryot population much and I hope that hon. Members will give their hearty support to any measure that will root out famine for ever and will help to solve the food problem of the State.

"Next I come to education. The need to impart education to the people must be understood in the real sense, namely, that social, economic and industrial education should be given to the people. The State cannot undertake this responsibility solely by itself. It is up to every legislator to take up this work and see that the citizens of this country are educated in all spheres of life. In this connection, I feel that the kind of education given in China will be all right for us so that we can acquire knowledge at the cheapest cost. It is the duty of every brother and sister in this House to see that no physical or mental energies of our fellow citizens are wasted, but are put to use to the advantage of the people of our country.

"Then, Sir, the finances of our State need to be augmented. Side by side with augmenting the finances of the State, the earning power of the individual citizen should also be improved. There is a lot of land that can be brought under cultivation, may be either on a co-operative basis or by leasing the land to individuals, who are interested in cultivation. As a lawyer, I know there are a number of applications filed in this connection and nothing has been done so far. Industries in the State including cottage industries should be developed. Cottage industries can very well be taken up by the womenfolk of our State and developed. Assignment of public lands should always be made on the basis of auction. Similarly, the right to operate bus routes should also be auctioned. If the Government do this, then much more money

13th May 1952] [Srimathi J. Sita Mahalaxmi]

will begin to flow into the coffers of the State than now. I am sure the revenue will increase doubly and trebly and make the State richer, so that the State will be in a position to solve all the problems that face us.

" I would next take up the question of the poorly paid teachers. I must express my profound gratitude to our leader, Rajaji, for granting certain concessions to the N.G.O.'s and local board employees in the matter of education and medical treatment. I would request the Government to extend the same facilities to the poorly paid teachers also. I also understand that the pay of teachers under local bodies is different from the one given to teachers employed in Government institutions. May I request the Government to examine this question carefully and see that every one is paid the same salary, because it is the teacher that trains the younger generation for life. Unless and until the teachers are properly paid and to their satisfaction, we cannot have good and efficient teachers to whom we can entrust our future generations.

" During my extensive tour in the north, I may submit to the House, Sir, I found that a great majority of the teachers and their families are living in poverty. So, I request the Government to get this question thoroughly examined and find out ways and means of improving the lot of the teachers and the low paid employees of the Government and other institutions. 11-30 a.m.

" Another point I wish to urge is about the condition of women. Of course, I do not mean to say that the claims of a woman should be considered because she is a woman. My only request is that sex should not be a disqualification. By considering woman as a mere woman what are we doing? We are practically not caring to utilise the energies of half the population of the State. Is it not necessary in the interests of our State that the energies of all the people of the State should be utilised in the best possible manner for the service of the Nation. Hon. Members might ask, 'What is it you have done?' Before joining the Bar, I was able to do a lot of work as a result of which there are a number of institutions. We have to give proper facilities for education and training to one and all. I therefore request the Hon. the Chief Minister and His Excellency the Governor to consider this aspect and see that the energies of all the people of this State, including woman, are utilised for the good of the country.

" Last but not the least is the problem relating to the uplift and maintenance of destitute men and women by the establishment of poor houses. The beggar problem is another which, I am sure, must be immediately tackled. Mentally and physically, the position of beggars is deteriorating; they are getting disease and they are spreading disease. Is it not then necessary, Sir, that this beggar problem is rooted out by proper legislation? Poor houses must be opened all round and beggars must be given work and provided with food and clothing. By extracting the maximum

[Srimathi J. Sita Mahalaxmi]

[13th May 1952]

possible work from the beggars, I am sure the Government will be able to meet the cost of the poor houses to some extent and minimise their burden of maintenance.

“ Lastly, it is up to one and all of us, who are elected by the people not only to sit here and pass legislation from time to time, but also to see that we work and fulfil the desires and wishes of our constituencies. The Government by themselves will not be able to do everything and they will be often asking, ‘ Where are the funds? ’. Funds are not wanting; funds will be forthcoming automatically provided we take up the work in a missionary spirit. I would therefore appeal to the Hon. the Chief Minister and the hon. Members of this House to see that our time as legislators, is utilised to the best advantage of the nation, so that our people will be happy, wealthy and healthy. With these few words, Sir, I request you once again to kindly convey our hearty thanks to His Excellency for his Address and we hope that His Excellency's Government will be only for the people and people.”

* SRI N. ANNAMALAI PILLAI :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, இன்று விவாதிக்கப்படும் மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னர் அவர்களுடைய பிரசங்கத்தை ஆதரித்து சில வார்த்தைகள் கூற விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த தேசம் சுதந்திரம் அடைந்த பிறகு புதிய அரசியல் சட்டப்படி கூட்டப்பட்டிருக்கும் கூட்டமாகும் இது. இந்த தேசம் என்ன செய்யப்போகிறதென்பதை உலகம் எதிர்பார்த்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறது. ஆயிரம் வருஷங்களாக அடிமைப்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருந்த இந்த தேசம் இன்று சுதந்திரம் அடைந்துவிட்டது. ‘ ஓராயிரம் ஆண்டு ஒய்ந்து கிடந்த பின்னர் வாராறு வந்துதித்த மாமனியைத் தோற்போமோ ’ என்று பாரதியார் சொல்லிப்போனார். ஆயிரம் வருஷங்களுக்குப் பிறகு கிடைத்த சுதந்திரத்தை நாம் மிக ஜாக்கிரதையாகப் பாதுகாக்கவேண்டும். மனதிலுள்ள குரோதங்களை விட்டொழித்து, தேசத்தின் பணியைத் தெய்வப் பணியாகக்கருதி, கடமையைச் செலுத்தவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. இந்த நிலைமையில், மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னர் அவர்கள் புதிய சட்டசபைகளைத் திறந்து வைத்து பேசிய பேச்சில் கிரியாம்சையில் உடனே செய்யாத காரியத்தைத் திடீரென்று சொல்லத் துணியவில்லை. இப்பொழுது தான் இந்தச் சபை கூடுகிறது. நாம் புதிய மந்திரி சபையையும் அமைத்திருக்கின்றோம் ; மந்திரிகளும் சட்டசபை அங்கத்தினர்களும் ஒன்று சேர்ந்து, திட்டங்களை வகுத்து, அந்தத் திட்டங்களை தேசத்தின் முன் சமர்ப்பிக்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது. இவையெல்லாவற்றையும் நன்றாக யோசித்து மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னர் அவர்கள் உடனடியாகச் செய்யவேண்டிய வேலைகள் என்னவென்பதைக் கவனித்து பஞ்ச நிவாரண வேலையை நமக்கு எடுத்துக்கூறியிருக்கிறார்.

“ இந்த நாடு பஞ்சத்தில் மூழ்கிக் கிடக்கிறது. ஆறு வருஷங்களாக மழை இல்லாமல், மக்கள் பசியால் வாடியிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு உண்ண உணவு இல்லை, உடுக்க உடை இல்லை, இருக்க இடமில்லை, குடிக்கத் தண்ணீர் இல்லை. இந்தத் தரித்திர கோலத்துடன் தரித்திர நாராயணர்களாக மக்கள் காட்சியளிக்கிறார்கள். இதைத் தடுப்பதற்கு ஒவ்வொரு அங்கத்தினரும் தங்கள் கடமையைச் செய்யவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. மக்களின் வோட்டுப் பெற்று வந்த அங்கத்தினர்கள் என்ன பிரதிபலன் செய்யப் போகின்றார் என்று வாக்காளர்கள் எதிர்பார்த்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதை அனுசரித்துதான் அன்று மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னர் அவர்கள் பிரசங்கத்தில் ராயலினைப் பஞ்சம் முதலியவற்றைத் தடுப்பதற்கு வேண்டிய யோசனைகளைக் குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கிறார். முதன் முதலாக அமைக்கப்பட்ட இந்தச் சபையில் இந்த இராஜ்யத்தின் தலைவராக நியமிக்கப் பட்டிருக்கும் மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னர் அவர்களுடைய பிரசங்கம் என்ன வென்பதைப் பொறுமையாகக் கேட்டு, அதிலுள்ள குற்றங்களுகளை அறிந்து பதில் சொல்லுவதற்கு சக்தியற்றவர்களாக இந்தச் சபை பரிமளிக்கிறது.

13th May 1952] [Sri N. Annamalai Pillai]

மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னர் பேச்சைத் தடுத்துவிட்டு சிலர் வெளியேறினது வெட்கப்படுவேண்டிய விஷயமாகும். மாகாண சர்க்கார் கவர்ன்மென்ட் திருத்த தலைவராக ஒரு கவர்னரை நியமித்தோம். அந்தக் கவர்னர் சொல்கிற யோசனைகளைப் பொறுமையுடன் கேட்பதற்குச் சக்தியற்ற தன்மையில் இந்த முதல் கூட்டம் ஆரம்பமாகியிருக்கிறது. 'முதல் கோணல், முற்றும் கோணல்' என்பதுபோல் இந்தக் கூட்டம் ஆரம்பமாகியிருக்கிறது என்று தான் நான் சொல்லவேண்டியிருக்கிறது.

“மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னரையை வார்த்தையைக் காது கொடுத்துக் கேட்டு என்ன திட்டம் இருக்கிறது, என்ன செய்யப்போகின்றார் என்பதைத் தெரிந்துகொண்டு அவைகளில் தவறுகள் இருந்தால், கவர்னரையை பிரசங்கத்திற்குப் பிறகு குணதோஷங்களைப் பேசியிருந்தால், இந்தச் சபையிலுள்ள அங்கத்தினர்களை உலகம் பாராட்டி யிருக்கும்.

“மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னர் பிரசங்கத்தின்போது அலெக்சாண்டிரியில் நடந்த காரியம் இந்த தேசத்திற்குக் களங்கத்தை உண்டுபண்ணியிருக்கின்றது. என்போலுள்ள தேசபக்தர்கள் இதைச் சகித்துக்கொண்டிருக்கமுடியாது. எவ்வளவு பெரிய தேசபக்தர்களாக இருந்தாலும், எவ்வளவு செல்வாக்கு வாய்ந்தவர்களாக இருந்தாலும், அவர்களுக்கும் கடமை இருக்கிறது. அந்தக் கடமையை அவர் நிறைவேற்றாமற்போனால் தேசம் முன்றேறு முடியாது. உதாரணமாக, கவர்னர் பிரசங்கம் ஆரம்பிக்குமுன்னே கவர்னரை அலட்சியம் செய்து, கவர்னரையை பிரசங்கத்தைக் கேட்காமல், அவர் இந்தச் சபையில் வருவதற்கு யோக்கியதையிலில்லையென்று சொல்லும் படியான நிலைமையில் இந்தச் சபையில் சில மெம்பர்கள் இருந்தார்களென்றால் இது வெட்கப்படுமபடியான விஷயமாகும். உலகம் நம்மைப் பார்த்துச் சிரிக்கும். நான் காங்கிரசில் 32 வருஷங்களாகச் சேவை செய்திருக்கிறேன். ஏழு முறை சிறை சென்றிருக்கிறேன். அப்படி 7 வருஷம் சிறையில் வசித்திருக்கிறேன் என்பதனால் எனக்குக் கடமை இனிமேல் இல்லையென்று யாராலும் சொல்லமுடியாது. கடமை இருக்கிறது. அவர்களுடைய செய்கையால் தேசத்திற்குத் தாங்க முடியாத அவமானம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது.

“கனம் அங்கத்தினர்களில் சிலர் கவர்னர் பிரசங்கத்தை மறித்து, கவர்னர் பேசுவதற்கு லாயக்கில்லையென்று சொல்வதற்குத் துணிந்து பேசிவிட்டு வெளியேறின செய்கையானது வப்பரிதமானது. இந்த தேசம் இன்னும் அடிமையாக இருக்கவேண்டுமென்று அவர்கள் நினைக்கிறார்களா அல்லது சுதந்திரமாக வாழவேண்டுமென்று நினைக்கிறார்களா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன். பேசியவர் ஒருவர் மாதிரி குற்றவாளி யல்ல அப்படிப் பேசியவரைப் பின்பற்றி வெளியேறிய அத்தனை பேர்களும் குற்றவாளிகள் தான். வெளியில் இருப்பவர்கள் நம்மைப்பற்றி என்ன நினைப்பார்கள் என்பதை அவர்கள் தெரிந்துக்கொள்ளவில்லை போலும். சென்னை ராஜ்ய மக்கள் மரியாதை இன்னதென்று தெரியாதவர்கள், அரசாங்கத்தை நடத்தும் யோக்கியதை இல்லாதவர்கள் என்ற கெட்ட பெயரை அவர்கள் வாங்கிக்கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த நிலைமையில் கவர்னர் பிரசங்கம் நடந்திருக்கிறது. 'தொண்டு செய்யும் அடிமை உனக்குச் சுதந்திர நினைவோட' என்று பாரதியார் சொல்லிப் போனார். அடிமைகளை, உங்களுக்கு சுதந்திரம் வேண்டுமென்ற நினைவோ என்று கேட்டிருக்கிறார். அதே முறையில் நாம் இன்றைய தினம் இருக்கின்றோம்.

“வட ஆற்காடு ஜில்லாவானது பஞ்சத்தில் மூழ்கிக் கிடக்கிறது. என்னுடைய ஜில்லா மலைப்பாதேசம். எங்கு பார்த்தாலும் தண்ணீர் கிடையாது. எவ்வளவு ஆழம் வெட்டினாலும் கிணறுகளில் தண்ணீர் கிடைப்பதில்லை. ஜனங்களுக்குக் குடிக்கத் தண்ணீர் இல்லை. இயற்கை விரோதமாக இருக்கிறது. இந்த நிலைமையில் சென்ற மந்திரிசபையிலிருந்து ஸ்ரீ பக்தவத்சலம் அவர்கள் வடாற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் சாத்தனூர் அணைத்திட்டத்தை ஏற்படுத்தினார். அதற்கான 'சர்வே' யாவும் செய்து முடித்தாய்விட்டது. ஐந்து வருஷ திட்டத்தில் அது சேர்க்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இந்த மந்திரிசபை அதைக் கவனிக்குமென்று நினைக்கிறேன். கனம் பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் இதில் கவனம் செலுத்தி வறண்டுபோன வடாற்காடு ஜில்லாவிற்கு ஒரு நீர்த்தேக்கம் கிடைக்கும்படிச் செய்வாரென்று நம்பு

[Sri N. Annamalai Pillai] [13th May 1952]

கிறேன். எங்கள் ஜில்லா நீர்த்தேக்கம் இல்லாத ஜில்லா. ஒரு செனகரியமும் சர்க்காரால் செய்யப்படாமல் பஞ்சத்தில் மூழ்கிக் கிடக்கின்ற ஜில்லா. ஆகையால் அந்த அணைக்கட்டுத் திட்டத்தை ஏற்படுத்தும்படி நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

“உபாத்தியாயர்கள் விஷயத்தில் ஒன்று சொல்ல விரும்புகின்றேன். கவர்ன்மெண்டு சர்வீஸில் இருக்கின்ற உபாத்தியாயர்களுக்கு ஒரு விதமும், உதவி பெறும் பள்ளிக்கூடங்களில் இருக்கிறவர்களுக்கு ஒரு விதமும் சம்பளம் கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது. அலவாஸ் விஷயத்தில் பல கோளாறுகள் இருக்கின்றன. இந்தக் கோளாறுகளை ஒழித்து, சர்க்காருடைய பள்ளிக் கூடங்களில் இருக்கின்ற உபாத்தியாயர்களுக்கு என்ன செனகரியங்கள் உண்டோ அவ்வளவையும் மற்ற பள்ளிக்கூடங்களில் இருப்பவர்களுக்குச் செய்வதுடன், இதை மாகாண சர்வீசாகச் செய்யவேண்டும். கவர்ன்மெண்ட் பள்ளிக்கூடங்களில் வேலை செய்யாமல், உதவி பெறும் பள்ளிக்கூடங்களில் 10 வருஷ சர்வீஸ் செய்திருப்பவர்களுக்கு இந்த சர்வீஸ் கிடைக்காமற் போய்விடுகின்றது. ஆகையால், அவர்களுையும் மாகாண சர்வீசாக மாற்ற வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன்.

“மற்றும் ஒரு வார்த்தை சொல்லிவிட்டு என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகின்றேன். மதுவிலக்கைப்பற்றி ஒரு வார்த்தை. மதுவிலக்குச் சட்டத்தை முதன் முதலில் கொண்டுவருகையில் இந்த மதுவிலக்கைப் பிரதம ராக் கனம் ராஜாஜி இருந்துவந்தபோது, ஜனங்களுக்கு அவர் என்ன உறுதி மொழி கொடுத்தாரென்றால், இந்த மதுவிலக்கினால் ஏற்படக்கூடிய நஷ்டத்தை சரிக்கட்டுவதற்கு விற்பனை வரி போடுகிறேன். மதுவிலக்கினால் ஏற்படும் நஷ்டத்திற்கேற்ற வருமானம் விற்பனை வரியினால் விந்துவிடும்” என்று சொன்னார். ஒரு சில அங்கத்தினர்கள் சொல்லுகின்றார்கள், கள்ளுக்கடைகளைத் திரும்பவும் திறக்கவேண்டுமென்று. நான் சொல்லுகின்றேன், கள்ளுக்கடைகளைத் திறக்கக்கூடாது என்று. அதனால் ஜனங்கள் தூர்த்தர்களாகப் போய்விடுவார்கள். மதுவிலக்கு அவர்களை நல்லவர்களாகச் செய்திருக்கிறது. மதுவிலக்கு மிகவும் அவசியம். ஆனால், மதுவிலக்குச் சட்டத்தை ரத்து செய்துவிடவேண்டுமென்று யாரேனும் சொல்லுவதைக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு அம்மாதிரி செய்வார்களானால், இந்த விற்பனை வரியையும் எடுத்துவிடவேண்டுமென்று நான் சொல்லுகின்றேன். மதுவிலக்கை எடுத்துவிட்டு, விற்பனை வரியையும் மக்களின் மேல் விதித்தால் அது கொள்ளையடிப்பதுபோலாகும் என்று சொல்லி, இந்தச் சபைமுன் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும் தீர்மானத்தை நான் ஆதரிக்கின்றேன்.”

11-45
a.m.

* SRI V. RAMAKRISHNA :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I join Sir Mahomed Usman in tendering my respectful congratulations to His Excellency the Governor for having invited Rajaji, one of the greatest living statesmen of our country, to form the Ministry. His Excellency's action was criticised on the ground that he had not followed the constitutional practices set up in recent times in Great Britain. In my view, His Excellency is not only constitutionally correct but also politically just. Ours is a written Constitution. While section 164 (2) lays down that the Council of Ministers shall be collectively responsible to the Legislative Assembly, section 177 read with section 194 (4) permits the Chief Minister, although he is not a Member of the Lower House, to take part in the proceedings of that House. Whereas, Sir, in Great Britain if the Prime Minister is a Member of the House of the Lords, he cannot in any circumstances address the House of Commons. It is therefore just and right that the people's representative in Great Britain must have the chance of dealing with the Prime Minister directly. Here, as we have already seen, our Chief Minister has played a very great part already in the

13th May 1952] [Sri V. Ramakrishna]

deliberations of the Lower House. The Lower House here can possibly have no complaint as to his being absent from its deliberations and it not being able to influence him in his policies.

“ As regards the political aspect, Sir, those hon. Members who know the history of the State know full well that the Congress Party was divided into three groups. I have the honour to represent one of those groups—the Krishikar Lok Party—in this House. The K.M.P. Party is led by my hon. Friend, Sri Prakasam. These groups, especially the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party and the Krishikar Lok Party parted company with the Congress because some of the Congressmen in the State forgot the bases of their political and economic policies which they had derived from the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi and misused power for their personal ends. Sir, the electorate have rightly rejected many of those gentlemen, especially pseudo Congressmen who, in the garb of the Congressmen, tried to exploit their position for their personal ends and for the personal benefit of their friends. The electorate must therefore be deemed to have returned people who are wedded to the principles and teachings of Mahatma Gandhi, of truth, non-violence, democracy, and communal harmony. Now, Sir, the mandate which the people gave to my hon. Friend, Sri Prakasam, is to implement these policies and not to associate himself with the Communists who believe in falsehood and violence as against truth and non-violence of Gandhism. They believe in the supremacy of the class over the nation. They believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat. There can therefore be no possibility of a mandate from the people for any such association with the Communist Party. We, Sir, have agreed to support and give Rajaji responsive co-operation. Because of our support and the support of such of those Independents who believe in Gandhism, though they have been returned on the anti-Congress ticket, Rajaji had rightly been invited by His Excellency the Governor to form the Ministry.”

SRI C. RAJESWARA RAO :—“ On a point of information, Sir. Did the electorate ask the K.L.P. to support the Congress Ministry which was rejected by it? ”

* SRI V. RAMAKRISHNA :—“ I am glad that the representative of the Communist Party in this House has raised this question. The electorate who voted for us have certainly indicated to us not to have any truck with the Communists at any rate.”
(Laughter.)

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ On a point of order, Sir. I submit that it is not only waste of time but entirely out of order to go into partisan politics on the floor of the House. What the electorate told their members, the members know and will answer their electorate whoever the electorate may be and whoever the leaders. We need not go into that discussion.”

* SRI V. RAMAKRISHNA :—“ Sir, His Excellency has rightly laid stress on the problems facing the people of the Ceded

[Sri V. Ramakrishna]

[13th May 1952]

districts. While the Government have taken fairly adequate steps to meet the situation, I would like to submit for the consideration of the Hon. Chief Minister that if the amount of effort which they are concentrating in that area is to bear the fullest fruit, he should have a high-ranking officer like a Member of the Board of Revenue, posted in those areas to see that the Collectors get the job done and are not tied down too much by red-tape. He should also be given wide financial powers, so that he can see that the benefits which the Government propose to pass on to the people are fully utilized.

"Sir, the most urgent problem which faces this State is the problem of food. The Governments, commencing with that of my non. Friend, Sri Prakasam, under which I held a high office, have unfortunately not solved this fundamental problem. Our State is becoming poorer and poorer day by day. When the British left us, we had about 16 ounces of food available *per capita per diem*. To-day, Sir, we have barely 12 ounces. This deterioration is very serious. It is undermining the health of our people and their moral fibre. In a State like ours, where all the natural factors are in our favour, there is no reason why we should not be able to solve this problem. Sir, food is a function of four variables: sunshine, manpower, fertilizers and moisture. As regards sunshine, there are few countries in the world which have such an abundance of it as we have. Manpower is equally abundant. Fertilizer is a thing which can be manufactured by us as nitrogen, the most important constituent, is abundant in the air around us. There is therefore no reason why as in other countries we should not synthesise it and use it for increasing food production. As regards moisture, we have rivers like the Krishna and the Godavari, which are perennial ones, most of whose waters go waste into the sea. These waters can be utilized by developing some of the projects like Nandikonda which, I believe, is now under the consideration of the Planning Commission set up by the Government of India. With these words, Sir, I support the motion before the House."

12 noon. SRI M. SATYANARAYANA :—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Motion moved by my hon. Friend, Sri M. Sitharama Dass, to thank His Excellency for his Address."

HON. MEMBERS :—"Please speak in Hindi."

SRI M. SATYANARAYANA :—"Sir, I am willing to speak in Hindi provided you get me Hindi reporters."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"You can speak in simple Hindi suitable for this House."

SRI M. SATYANARAYANA :—"Yes, Sir, I will do so for a few minutes towards the close if the Chairman will permit me."

"In supporting the Motion of thanks to His Excellency, I want to make a few observations. Sir, I am a very humble worker in the field of constructive activity. I have not had much to do either with power politics or politics as such. Of Course, I had

13th May 1952] [Sri M. Satyanarayana]

the honour of being a Member of Parliament and of the Constituent Assembly, because I was wanted there for some specific work in connexion with some language problems, as I am a language worker. With very little experience I find myself rather in a more advantageous position, because I have not developed any definite inhibitions either about parties or about politics. In the course of this debate in which people belonging to various parties have participated there were a number of complaints and criticisms. One of the criticisms that was levelled against the Address of His Excellency the Governor was that it was very brief and did not mention many details as was expected by the people. I really do not understand the need for this criticism. His Excellency joined duty as Governor very recently and the new Government was also formed very recently. It was therefore in the fitness of things that the Address should have been very brief. If the Address had dealt with many things it would have certainly been considered as something that was very unjust as His Excellency and his Government could not have studied these problems properly. They did not know what was the position in this State and it was for the purpose of giving an opportunity to the Members who do not belong to the party in power to state what they want that the Address was made very brief. This is what I consider to be the reason for its brevity. It was also stated that the Governor was not very constitutional and he did not show sufficient statesmanship in asking Sri Rajaji to form the Government. I do not want to enter into details because they have become so controversial for the reason that there are a number of personal as well as party problems involved. I will leave it to those who can deal effectively with these problems. As we all know His Excellency comes from a family with high educational attainments and it is impossible for me to conceive that he could be unconstitutional or unjust. As one who was very closely associated with the Central Government as Minister in charge of Natural Resources, as one who was associated with the freedom struggle and as one who was associated with democratic institutions in this country as well as outside, he could never have been unconstitutional. If at all he has done anything, not only by virtue of his position but by virtue of his knowledge and experience, he has acted very constitutionally. This is what I feel.

" In the course of these discussions I found one or two points which I think I must answer. It is always better in a House like this that we do not indulge in personalities and personal criticisms. But, in spite of this, I find that some Members while discussing the politics of the State also try to make certain comparisons and certain analogies. I do not claim to be very proficient or to have studied much of English literature, but it pained me much to hear one comparison that was made as far as our Chief Minister was concerned, by one of the Members. It pained me a good deal. Why? It was because our Chief Minister was compared with one of the third-rate and fourth-rate poets of England. As one who has been in the public life of this country

[Sri M. Satyanarayana]

[13th May 1952]

for about thirty years now, I have been watching the career, the service, the sacrifices and the greatness of our present Chief Minister. Why should anyone compare Rajaji's life and Rajaji's qualities with a third or fourth-rate poet of England? Rajaji's life itself has been a great poem, a poem of great activity, great service and great sacrifice. Is it not sufficient for everybody to get the necessary inspiration to do some useful work? I am really surprised to find that such a comparison should have been made and it occurs to me some people are not able to make proper comparisons on account of personal inhibitions. I would also try to make a comparison and to my mind it appears that through his services and sacrifices Rajaji has become a spotless diamond and whoever goes to him sees his own reflection. If a man has made sacrifices he sees his own sacrifices in him; if a man happens to be a youth he sees his own youth reflected in him; if he happens to be a poet he sees a poet in him; if he happens to be a politician he sees a politician in him; if he is a diplomat he sees a diplomat in him and no man can see in Rajaji anything except what he himself looks like. On this analogy I find that the comparison which was sought to be made by a particular Member who compared Rajaji's life with that of a third or fourth-rate poet has become true of the Member. (Hear, hear.)

"Another criticism that was made in the course of the discussion was that the Governor had not only made his Address very brief but had allowed his Chief Minister to dictate his policy. Really, it is the duty of the Governor to consult his Chief Minister in regard to the policies to be pursued. The Chief Minister who has also entered on his office recently is placed in a disadvantageous position. He could not have decided on the long range and short range policies of the Government so soon and it is up to the Opposition to state what type of policy should be pursued; how best we could distribute the 53 crores of revenue of this country among the 55 crores of people here; how best it would be possible for the Government to distribute the sources of wealth or the sources of production among the people; how we can reduce the highest to the lowest pedestal and how the common man could be made more than a common man. It is a question of the process to be gone through and in the course of the process we, the legislators, are given the privilege of discussing these matters without hurting anybody. If we abide by what Mahatmaji said it is only by gentle persuasion that we should reach a level where every Member would have the option of offering suggestions for the good of this House. That is how legislators should perform their duties. It is only for the purpose of giving us an object lesson in order to enable us to perform our duties properly in this Legislature that the Governor has deliberately made his speech very brief.

"I understand, Sir, that we are going to meet again next month when we might expect the Government to have made up their minds in order to give us an inkling of their views, what exactly is their policy in respect of economic and social institutions, what exactly is their policy in respect of land reform and what

13th May 1952] [Sri M. Satyanarayana]

other legislation will be brought before the House. We will then have ample opportunity to discuss these matters. This is the reason why the Governor's Address has been so brief and I congratulate the Governor for having given us not only a very brief Address but a very good Address.

"Now, my time is up and I cannot touch on many points I wanted to mention, but I would like to mention one important point which occurred in the course of the debate. One hon. Member made a challenge to the Government saying, 'Give us six months' time and we will make this State a heaven.' I really admire the courage with which this challenge has been made. I wish I were much younger in order to be as responsible or irresponsible as the person who made that statement. This State is very well known for its wisdom, for its democratic traditions, for its greatness and for its statesmanship. With all these and, with the experience the Congress Party has, even that party has not been able to convert this State into a heaven. Therefore the statement made by the hon. Member is one which only people who are ignorant about the real state of affairs could make. It is therefore better that in the course of the debates we make statements for which we are fully responsible."

SRI C. RAJESWARA RAO :—"I take full responsibility for what I have said."

SRI M. SATYANARAYANA :—"The hon. Member may take the responsibility but I am not willing to credit him with that responsibility. I quite agree with the hon. Member that he can make this State a heaven provided he is given full responsibility for killing all opposition by chopping off their heads. It is not possible, therefore, for anyone in this House to feel enthusiastic over remarks of the kind made by the hon. Member. With these words, I feel it my pleasant duty to support the Motion of thanks to His Excellency so ably moved by my hon. Friend, Sri M. Sitharama Dass. If the Chair would permit me, I am willing to speak a few words in Hindi."

* THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have great pleasure in associating myself with the Motion of thanks that has been moved by my hon. Friend, Sri Sitharama Dass. Apart from the valuable Address that His Excellency has delivered I would like to pay my personal tribute to him for all the tours that he has undertaken in Rayalaseema and other parts of the State where famine has been raging, at very great inconvenience and personal discomfort and in the hot weather too. He went through the whole area and acquainted himself with all the difficulties, and the relief measures that this Government have taken are not a little due to the interest that he has taken and therefore, Sir, I would like to pay my tribute to His Excellency."

"At one point, Sir, I did not want to intervene in this debate but I was compelled to do so for the reason that many

[Sri N. Ranga Reddi] [13th May 1952]

hon. Members made mention of many projects—irrigation projects—that have been undertaken but whose pace has been slowed down. The hon. Member, Srimathi Sitamahalakshamma, made her maiden speech and I offer my congratulations to her. People might say that a lawyer is necessarily a very good speaker. I beg to differ from this proposition. I have known very great and distinguished lawyers with a very lucrative practice at the Bar, who have been failures as parliamentarians. But to-day I find that Srimathi Sitamahalakshamma has made a good speech. (Interruption.) I am only saying that every lawyer need not be a good parliamentarian. I can quote many instances from English parliamentary life. I can say, Sir, that though Sir Edward Hall and Mr. Bennet had been in Parliament for more than 11 years, their best admirers have said that they have not been good parliamentarians. That is my opinion. Sir, I particularly referred to the speech of Srimathi Sitamahalakshamma because she has made a very good suggestion in regard to the policy that ought to be pursued by this Government. She has said that minor irrigation projects should be taken up with speed and executed immediately. I may state, however, for the information of this hon. House that these great rivers—the Godavari, the Krishna and the Cauvery—are not flowing throughout the land and it is only some parts of the State that are benefited by these great rivers. If the other parts of the State are to be benefited there is no other go except to take up the execution of small irrigation projects. But, when we are faced with a food crisis like the present one, we should consider whether any project that is to be undertaken would yield satisfactory results. There was a time, i.e., before we were importing food from outside, when we could take up any project. Now, the food that is being imported from outside is very costly and we have been thrown back on our own resources. The shorter the time in which we could make ourselves self-sufficient the better it will be.

12-15 P.m. “Therefore, it is absolutely necessary that we should spend our money on projects which will give us not only immediate return but also the largest return. Let it not be understood that this Government have no sympathy for the irrigation projects that have been undertaken by the previous Government. If any project has been slowed down it is because of the difficult financial position of the State which forced the Government to draw up an order of priorities. The Government are also trying their level best to see that the finances of the State are carefully husbanded and spent properly. In this connexion, I should particularly commend the example of the people of Tirunelveli district who have subscribed a very large sum of money as loan for carrying out the Manimuttar Project.”

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“The work on that project has been slowed down by the Government.”

* THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“I have no information that the work on that project has been slowed down. The

13th May 1952] [Sri N. Ranga Reddi]

work on that project has been going on. If really our State ought to progress, I submit that all the moneys that have been locked up with the agriculturists in this State should flow into the coffers of our State. I do not mean to say that the agriculturists should pay more by way of taxation. There are various other ways to get the money that has been locked up. It is wrong to think that the rich capitalists and traders have got large sums of money, and that they can help the Government by lending money. On account of the rise in the prices of foodgrains, the financial condition of the agriculturists has improved to a very great extent during the last seven or eight years. If they want to improve their economic position further, it is for them to come forward and liberally subscribe to the loans floated either by the State or the Central Government. The hon. Mr. Chakkarai Chettiar . . ."

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—" I have not yet become a Minister."

* THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" My hon. Friend Sri Chakkarai Chetty made mention of the fact that land has not been given to the tiller of the soil. To-day there is a famine prevailing in large areas of the State. May I submit, Sir, even if land belongs to the tiller of the soil, if there is no rain, famine will continue in the country. After all, the remedy that is proposed has no connexion at all to the problem of solving the famine prevailing in many parts of this State. I can understand the hon. Member saying that the economic position of the tiller of the soil can be improved by making him the owner of the land. But I cannot understand the argument that famine can be eliminated if the tiller is made the owner of the land. It is all very easy to raise a slogan that land should belong to the tiller of the soil. What does the hon. Member mean by the term 'tiller of the soil'? Does he mean the actual person who holds the plough or the owner of the land who employs him? I submit, Sir, that in matters relating to the improvement of the position of tenants and tillers of the soil there should be clear-cut ideas and there is no use merely quoting slogans in this respect.

" My hon. Friend, Sri Rajeswara Rao, at one time, in the course of the debate, said that the Members of the Government had made interruptions in the course of his speech because they were afraid of him. Let me tell him that this Government is not afraid of any one, least of all the Communists. Probably the hon. Member has been thinking that by the method of violence which his party has been advocating he can bring down anybody and he can crush us. Let me tell him that if he were to pursue that policy, we are also prepared to do all that lies within our power, and only when it is inevitable we will bow down to what he says. I would like to quote on this occasion what a famous politician in England had said, 'We will not be cowed down by threats. We will make our will and do our deeds.' I only wish to say that and nothing more. If the hon. Member has got any constructive

[Sri N. Ranga Reddi]

[13th May 1952]

suggestions to make or offers any constructive criticism, this Government is prepared to listen to him. Let him also state what he wishes to state at the right time, in the right place and in the proper manner.

“ Mr. Govinda Menon, in the course of his speech, praised my revered leader to the skies and narrated all his past achievements and I thought there was no selfishness on his part when he made mention of these things. But I could discern a note of selfishness when he said towards the end of his speech : ‘ Whatever Rajaji has said has come true. In one of his speeches, he has referred to the event of his coming back to the politics of this State as his downfall. Probably this may also come to be true.’ (Interruption from Sri M. P. Govinda Menon.) Probably the hon. Member is frustrated by the fact that Sri Rajaji has become the leader of the Congress Party and a Congress Ministry has been formed. He has been fondly imagining that the leader of his Party (Sri T. Prakasam) would form the Ministry and that he would be able to sit on the Treasury Benches. It is very unfortunate that this did not happen. I should only say that the hon. Member had been living in a fool’s paradise. Let the hon. Member understand that the present Government is not going to fall and this Government will gather more and more strength soon. The Opposition groups measured their strength with the Government by putting up a candidate for the Speakership. (Interruptions.) I do not want to say anything more on this subject except to say that the Congress Party is gaining strength day by day. Let not the Opposition fondly think that by criticizing the Government they can occupy the Treasury Benches.

“ The hon. Members have referred in their speeches to the execution of some of the irrigation projects. I have all my sympathy for those projects and we shall do our best in the matter.”

* Mr. T. J. M. WILSON :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I think that I should really thank you for having at last called me to speak. In fact there is hardly any need—and it is presumptuous—for any member of my party with the Hon. Chief Minister as its leader to speak or to seek to answer any of the criticisms levelled by the other side. But, we have also to justify our membership and I rise therefore to formally support the Motion of thanks to His Excellency the Governor for his Address and say a few words.

“ It is a matter of regret and pain that people and parties get upset when any reference of appreciation or emulation is made to a feature or event of another system or country. As it has been amply explained, the reference here in His Excellency’s Address to the Head of the Commonwealth and British monarchy is only a formal one and is a constitutional propriety. We have voluntarily agreed to be a Member of the Commonwealth and we are. I often wonder what theory or ideology it can be which blinds men to facts that exist. But even if a reference of appreciation is made, what is wrong with it? Whatever may have happened in the past in the long period of evolution, in striking contrast against that

13th May 1952] [Mr. T. J. M. Wilson]

background of the past, the Commonwealth has now come to symbolise the unity and the voluntary association and membership of different countries. And the British monarchy symbolises that continuity and the amazing capacity of a people to conserve what is best in their past and yet to break away from it and go forward. It symbolises the glorious efforts of a nation to achieve equality and yet not to allow the flame of liberty to flicker. Mankind has been struggling from the dawn of history and moving forward—in different paths, of course, on account of their different features and varying conditions of development and certainly often falling and failing—but yet moving forward to the goal of human happiness and welfare and whatever experiments and achievements any people have made are the common legacy of all the people and they afford lessons for other peoples to learn and draw upon. And history in its dynamic motion and sweep will leave by and shall not forgive those who get stuck up in old ruts revolving and smarting under by-gone events and struggles such as those between India and England.

“ Much has been said now of democracy but there is nothing new or surprising, for democracy has since its birth been used and misused, mauled and mutilated; but what is surprising and lamentable is the almost similar fate being inflicted on ordinary concepts like majority and which have been so much bandied about and are invested with a mystic and supernatural air and meaning which we mere mortals cannot comprehend. But I might say that the Congress Party here, whose record is there now both as a political party and the Government in charge of conducting these phenomenal elections under the leadership of one of the foremost Indians, would uphold the high principles and purposes which inspired and sustained it and strive to work for democracy, for democracy is after all not a finished product to be borrowed or purchased, but is yet an ideal which all the progressive peoples all the world over are struggling to reach and enjoy.

“ To the argument that His Excellency's Address has not laid down the legislative policy of the Government, adequate answers have been given and may I venture a guess that that perhaps reveals that the Hon. Chief Minister and the Government headed by the Chief Minister are more wit and less art. A friend on the other side generated a lot of heat yesterday when he mentioned this. He argued that the Address deliberately omitted this, because the party wanted to assess its political position and party strength. I think that is a pretty correct reasoning. And instead of it being wrong or a mistake which my friend wanted to take it to be, is it not just the correct thing and the democratic thing for the majority party in the Legislature here to come to compromise with the other parties as far as possible, not deflecting of course from its basic principles, and seek to reflect the desire of the electorate which seems to have deliberately expressed such an opinion by not returning a majority of any party?

12-30
p.m.

[Mr. T. J. M. Wilson]

[13th May 1952]

“ The various amendments given notice of present a familiar picture of the problem in the State which again, if I may say so, resolves itself into two parts, namely, administrative and legislative. So far as administration is concerned, there has been a terrific lowering down of its morale, chiefly in its lower ranks, and there is much to be done to tone up and purify the administration. But I may say that the very fact of Rajaji's acceptance of leadership has already made a marked improvement in it and I hope that he will take early steps to build up and leave for the future an absolutely non-political, foolproof and efficient administrative machinery, for, after all, it is the basis and pivot of Government by any party.

“ Regarding the second aspect, the Hon. Chief Minister rightly said that agriculture is the soul of our problem. I plead with him to take early steps to get over the present crisis in agriculture, of the increasing fragmentation of land, agricultural indebtedness, etc., resulting in under-production. There has been much stress during these two days from the Government side on the word ‘priority’ in the matter of capital works. I plead with the Government not to bring in any question of priority but to find ways and means of overcoming the financial stringency, and not to prune down any capital works, but to go ahead with all the works which have already been initiated, and even to take on hand more minor irrigation works which would prove fruitful. I plead with the Government to bring down the still high prices by carefully watching the slump and to take immediate measures to increase industrial and agricultural production in the same emergency spirit and on the same war footing as we are fighting that ugly demon of famine which is bewitching the fair land of Rayalaseema.

“ It must be realized, Sir, that those terrible problems of poverty, disease and ignorance cannot be solved by a magic wand and they require years of toil and suffering and sacrifices. To those who ask why the Government have failed to solve them in the last six years and pronounce the judgment that the Congress Government have failed, may I reply that even in Soviet Russia, after perhaps the bloodiest revolution in history, there was more poverty, and far more suffering and terrible starvation than here for a much longer period than these six years? But I trust that the Government would lay emphasis and devote all the energies and resources towards building up a Welfare State. I hope that the Chief Minister would live long and give to this State not only the benefit of his ability which is known to be matchless, but also of his imagination which has sometimes in our country's history stirred the hearts of the people to an unprecedented extent.

“ I may point out that these complex and baffling problems of poverty and ignorance cannot be solved by legislation alone. Something more than mere legislation, that psychological atmosphere, some mental and moral virtues on the part of both the Government and the people and the parties are required.

13th May 1952] [Mr. T. J. M. Wilson]

"I pray that with the co-operation of all parties and all people true and sure foundations will be laid for a democracy in which there will not only be plenty and prosperity, but also freedom of the mind and the spirit."

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :— ' Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise with pleasure to associate myself with the Motion before the House, viz., the Motion of thanks to His Excellency for the Address he delivered to both Houses of the Legislature on the 6th of May 1952. In his Address His Excellency has referred to the orderly way in which the recent elections have been conducted. He has said that millions of our countrymen and countrywomen, some of them literate, but the majority of them illiterate, came to the polls in large numbers and voted to choose their respective candidates. Well, Sir, it should be admitted that the elections on the whole have been conducted in such a manner as would redound to the credit of all concerned."

SRI C. RAJESWARA RAO :—" No, they were not."

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" Well, I am sure, my view will be accepted by a vast majority in this House. I hope you will then not be able to object to that."

AN HON. MEMBER :—" What about the nominations to the Council? "

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" Nominations to this Council were only to a very limited extent.

" Of course, it is true we have not been able to get an absolute majority. In this connexion, criticisms have been levelled against the nomination of some members to the Council by the Governor. Well, it is not my duty on this occasion to talk at any length on the propriety of the nominations. I shall confine myself to more important matters.

" An objection has been raised at the outset, that His Excellency was not competent to deliver an Address to both Houses of Legislature, because he had called upon a minority party to form the Government and had asked a person who is not the chosen representative of the people to lead the Government. I shall not, Sir, in this connexion, go into the propriety of the allegations concerning the Governor's action. I shall confine myself to the question of the competence of His Excellency to deliver an Address to both Houses of Legislature and the competence of the leader of the Congress Party to form the Government.

" All those who contested the elections have received proportionate representation. The single largest party that has been returned to the lower House is the Congress Party."

SRI C. RAJESWARA RAO :—" No, it is not so."

THE HON. DR. M. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" Well, Sir, the figures speak for themselves. No one can contradict such a statement. Next to the Congress came the Communist Party. The

[Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao] [13th May 1952]

Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party could not set up candidates for all the seats in the Lower House. Among the candidates set up by the K.M.P. Party, only 35 candidates were returned. Hence it did not come with any grace from the leader of that party to tell His Excellency that he was not competent to call upon the single largest party to make an effort to form the Government. The suggestion that the people gave a mandate that irrespective of its strength the Congress alone was not competent to make an effort to form a stable welfare Government for this State, that other parties who had not the commensurate strength as the Congress though they had secured only 35, 25 and 60 seats were alone competent to form the Government—I may well call it not a suggestion but a sophistry—was too much for the public to swallow. Sir, I do not like to say anything more than what I have said on this aspect of the question.

“The gravamen of the charge of the Socialist Party with regard to the Governor's Address has been that the Address did not contain all the programmes and policies that are adumbrated by this Government. Sir, it is very clear in His Excellency's Address and he has specifically stated, that he would be addressing the two Houses of the Legislature again during the Budget Session when there would be an opportunity for a comprehensive review of all the measures which the Government propose to implement during the year under review for the development and welfare of the State. It has been pointed out that such an occasion would not give an opportunity to the members to discuss in detail the Governor's Address. I beg to submit, Sir, that there would be ample opportunity for the members to discuss vividly and threadbare every item in the programme and policy of the Government.

“His Excellency has referred in his Address to the two most important and urgent problems with which the Government are faced at the present juncture, i.e., firstly, the famine conditions in Rayalaseema, and secondly, the food situation. The Government, under the leadership of Rajaji, are earnestly concerned with the investigation of famine conditions in other parts of the State also. We are concerned with the ways and means to ameliorate the condition of the masses in those areas also.

“The next session being the Budget Session, it would give hon. Members ample opportunities to follow our policies and offer constructive criticisms. It was in that spirit of complete frankness and sincerity that His Excellency delivered this Address and he was also advised by us to do so.

“The Socialist Party has questioned the *bona fides* of the party-in-power and its leader. They have also contended that they would be denied the privilege of discussing in detail the programmes and policies of the Government during the Budget Session. I should respectfully submit to this House and through this House to the public at large that the whole of the Governor's speech especially his promise to give an opportunity to hon. Members of both Houses to hear him again during the Budget

13th May 1952] [Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao]

Session when the policies of the Government could be discussed threadbare, item by item, has been couched in a spirit of complete sincerity and I think that it is the most honest way of dealing with this House and the people at large. In this connexion, I am sorry to observe that the Socialist Party has been less than fair in its criticisms.

“ Some of the hon. Members returned by the Teachers' Constituencies have made references to our educational system and to the condition of the teachers in our State. The question of the status of the teachers, their difficulties with regard to emoluments and conditions of living and all that, have been under the consideration of Government for a long time. It has been remarked that we did not care to advise His Excellency to include a reference about them in his Address. Sir, I should like to state that we have not ignored them altogether. The concessions that were announced quite recently are indicative of our earnestness to improve their living conditions. We are most anxious to do what we can under the present circumstances.

“ As regards the revision of the salaries of secondary-grade teachers I should like to observe that the matter is receiving the earnest consideration of the Government. The question of the total revision of the scales of pay is a question of finance, which everybody knows. We want to look at it from the point of view of giving amenities according to needs and not in terms of money. I may also state in this connexion that the Government are considering the extension to teachers in aided schools, the concessions they have already announced in the case of teachers in schools under the control of local bodies. The financial aspects of such an extension are being carefully looked into.

“ References have been made with regard to the reorientation of our educational policy. I should like to state in this connexion that many reforms to reorient our educational system have been made during the last decade. It would be the policy of our Government not to proceed in haste. You may take it that due consideration will be given to each and every policy that we want to implement. In doing so I take this opportunity to welcome the co-operation of the esteemed educationists in this House and outside. We would respectfully welcome their co-operation and advice in every matter concerning the reorientation of our educational system.

“ I do not want to take up much of our time. I think, Sir, that I have said quite enough. With these words I heartily associate myself with other hon. Members in thanking His Excellency for his Address.”

* **SRI M. ETHIRAJULU** :—“ கனம் தலைவர் அவர்களே ! இன்று பேசப்படும் மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னர் அவர்களின் பிரசங்கத்தை ஆதரித்து 12-45
சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். p.m.

“ முதலாவதாக புது அரசியல் சட்டப்படி தேர்தல் நடந்து அப்பிரதி நிதிக்கொண்டு கூட்டப்படும் முதல் கூட்டமாகும் இது. சென்ற 1952-ம் ஆண்டு மேயர் 6-ந்தேதியில் மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னர் அவர்கள்

[Sri M. Ethirajulu] [13th May 1952]

நிகழ்த்திய பிரசங்கத்தில் உடனடியாக இந்த மாகாணத்திற்குச் செய்ய வேண்டிய எல்லா முக்கியக் காரியங்களையும் பற்றி குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கிறார். அவைகளை உடனே செய்யவேண்டிய எல்லா ஏற்பாடுகளையும் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். அவர் நிகழ்த்திய பிரசங்கத்திற்காக நான் முதலில் எனது மனமார்ந்த வந்தனத்தை செலுத்திக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். அத்துடன் கூட அன்று போடப்பட்டிருந்த 144 தடை உத்திரவைப் பற்றி பல அங்கத்தினர்கள் எதிர்த்து அது கனம் அங்கத்தினர்களிடையே உரிமைகளைப் பறிப்பதாகும் என்பதாக ஒரு மோஷனைக்கொண்டு வந்து விவாதித்தார்கள். அதை நான் எதிர்க்கின்றேன். யார் பதவியில் இருந்தாலும், எந்த சர்க்கார் இருந்தாலும் சரி, எதிர்க்கட்சி சர்க்கார் பதவியில் இருந்தாலும் சரி அமைதியைக்காக்க, ஒழுங்கை நிலைநிறுத்த இந்தமாதிரியான சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வருவது மிகவும் அவசியமானதாகும். எல்லா மெம்பர்களுடைய சொளகர்யத்தையும் உத்தேசித்தே தான் இந்தத் தடை உத்திரவை அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவந்தார்களே தவிர மெம்பர்களுடைய உரிமைகளைப் பறிப்பதற்குக் கொண்டு வரவில்லை. அப்படியிருக்க ஒரு அங்கத்தினர் இந்தச் சபையில் குறிப்பிட்டார். அவர் வரும்போது அவரைப் போலீசார்கள் வரமுடியாதபடி தடுத்து விட்டதாகவும், அதனால் தான் தன்னுடைய உரிமை போய்விட்டதாகவும், குறிப்பிட்டார். அது முற்றிலும் சரியானது அல்ல. அதைப் பற்றி நான் ஒன்று சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். அந்த மெம்பர் வரமுடியாத தடைபட்டு விட்டது என்பதை விட மேன்மை தங்கிய கவர்னர் அவர்களின் பிரசங்கத்தில் எதுவும் கலாட்டா நடப்பெறாமல் இருக்க வேண்டுமேயென அவர்கள் எடுத்துக் கொண்டு நடவடிக்கைதான் சரியானது என நான் குறிப்பிட விரும்புகிறேன். அவ்வளவு ஏற்பாடு செய்திருந்தோதிலும் கூட கனம் அங்கத்தினர்கள் கூச்சலிடக்கொண்டு வெளியேறியதும், காலரியிலிருந்து அவர்களுடைய ஆட்கள் சர்க்காருக்கு விரோதமான கூச்சலிட்டு கொடிகளைக் காட்டியதும் எல்லா மெம்பர்களும் அறிந்தது தான். சர்க்கார் அந்தத் தடை உத்திரவைப் போடாதிருந்தால் என்ன பலாத்காரச் செயல்களில் அவர்கள் இறங்குவார்களோ! யாருக்கும் தெரியாது. மெம்பர்கள் வரமுடியாத தடை ஏற்பட்டு விட்டது என்பது இந்த மாகாணத்திற்கு மாத்திரம் புதிது அல்ல என்பதற்கு ஒரு உதாஹனம் கூறுகிறேன். சுமார் 20 வருடங்களுக்கு முன்னால் கிங் ஐந்தாம் ஜார்ஜ் அவர்கள் ஒரு குறிப்பிட்ட மீட்டிங்குக்கு போகும்போது அங்கே யிருந்த போலிஸ் அதிகாரிகள் அவர்கள் போவதற்கு என்று ஒரு தனி பாதையும், மற்றவர்கள் போவதற்கு என்று மற்றொரு பாதையையும் ஒதுக்கி வைத்திருந்தார்கள். மற்றவர்கள் சாதாரணமாகப் போய்விட்டார்கள். ஐந்தாம் ஜார்ஜ் அரசர் அன்று வழக்கம் போல் காரில் போகாமல் அவர் போவதற்கென்று ஒதுக்கப்பட்டிருந்த பாதையில் நடந்து சென்றார். அவர் தான் ஜார்ஜ் அரசர் என்பதை அறியாத போலீஸ் ஈர்ஜன்ட் அவரைத் தடுத்து நிறுத்தி, கையைப் பிடித்து இழுத்து அப்பால் போகும்படி சொன்னான் என்பதை சரித்திரத்தில் பார்க்கலாம். ஆகையால் எல்லா இடங்களிலும் இது மாதிரியான சந்தர்ப்பம் நடப்பது சகஜம். ஆகையினால் போலீஸ்காரர்களே போடாமல் இருக்கலாமென்று சொல்வது கொஞ்சமும் பொருந்தாது. அவர்கள் மேல் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டுமென்பதும் பொருந்தாது.

“அடுத்தபடியாக கனம் ராஜாஜியின் மந்திரி சபை ஒரு வருஷ காலம் கூட நீடிக்கப் போவதில்லையென்பதாக பலர் பலவிதமாகப் பேசிவருகிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு நான் ஒன்று சொல்லுகிறேன். 16 வயதுடைய மார்க்கண்டேயன் தன்னுடைய பக்தியாலும், தெய்வத்திடமுள்ள அசைக்கமுடியாத நம்பிக்கையாலும் கடவுளைக் குறித்து தபம் செய்து தன்னுடைய ஆயுளை நீண்ட ஆயுளாக ஆக்கிக் கொண்டது பேரலகனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களும் கடவுளுடைய பக்தியினால் நீண்ட காலம் அரசு செய்ய முடியும். அவருடைய ஒரு வருட நிறமையைப் பார்த்து, மக்களை உணர்ந்து ஏ ராஜாஜியே உன் ஆட்சி தான் சரியான ஆட்சி. நீயே இம்மாகாணத்தைப் பல வருடங்கள் ஆட்சி செய்”, என அனுக்கிரஹம் செய்தாலும் செய்யக்கூடமென்பதில் சந்தேகமில்லை.”

“அடுத்தபடியாக சென்னை மாகாணத்தில் 154 பிரிவுகளைக் கொண்ட பிற்போக்கு இனத்தவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். குறிப்பாக வன்னிய குல

[Sri M. Ethirajulu]

“அத்துடன் தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு வரியிருக்கிறது. அந்த வரியின் பெயர் கொண்டாங்கி வரி. அந்த வரியை சரியாக மராமத்து செய்தால் எவ்வளவோ ஆயிரம் ஏக்கர் நிலங்களை மும்முறை பயிர் செய்ய முடியும். அதை முன்பு இருந்த அரசாங்கம் எதுவுமே கவனிக்கவில்லை. இப்போது கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் மந்திரி சபை அந்த கொண்டு வந்த வரியை செப்பனிட்டு டை ஆயிர லீல ஏக்கர் நிலங்களுக்கு பாசன வசதி கிடைக்கும்படி உடனே ஏற்பாடு செய்யவேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். அதையும் மற்ற விஷயங்களையும் கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் யோசித்துச் செய்யவேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு இத்துடன் நான் முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI S. RAMAKRISHNIAH :—“ అధ్యక్షా, ఎన్నికలైన తరువాత పట్టు
ప్రభుత్వ ప్రభుత్వము విర్వదుతుందని, రాష్ట్రములోని సమస్యలన్నీ పరిష్కరింపబడుతాయని
పదే పదే ప్రకటించబడుచువల్ల ఈ సమస్యల పరిష్కార మార్గాలు వాటి పట్ల
ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క పోలీసు గవర్నరుగారి ఆదేశమువల్ల తెలియనగును అని ప్రజా
నీకమంతా ఎంతో ఆశతో నిరీక్షిస్తున్నాయండగా, గవర్నరుగారి ఆదేశము వారికి ఆశా
భంగము కలుగజేసి వారిని అంధకారములో ముంచివేసినది. గవర్నరుగారి ఆదేశ
ములో సమస్యలకు సంబంధించినటువంటి విషయము లేవి లేవు. పోలీస్ డివిజన్ గురించి
గాని, లేకపోతే విద్యా సంస్కరణలు గురించిగాని మరే సమస్యను గురించిగాని ప్రస్తావన
లేదు. ఈ నాడు మధ్య ప్రజానీకాన్ని అనగా ఉపాధ్యాయులు, యం.డి.ఓ.లు,
మీనియర్స్ మొదలగువారిని ఎదుర్కొన్నటువంటి సమస్యలుయొక్క ప్రస్తావన గవ
ర్నరుగారి ఆదేశములో బొత్తిగా లేకపోవడం చాలా శోభనీయమని నేను మృచిస్తున్నాను.
అయితే ఈ విషయాలు ఈ సమస్యలన్నీ కూడా మరొక పర్యాయము
అనగా జూన్ మాసములో శాసన సభ సమావేశమైనప్పుడు ఆలోచించుకొనవచ్చు
నని కొందరు గౌరవనీయ సభ్యులు సూచించినారు. కాని, నేను మంచి చేయునది
విమనగా, లండన్ లోనిది డబ్బు ఖర్చుచేసి, గవర్నరుగారు ఉభయశాసన సభలను ఆదేశము
చేసే నిమిత్తం ఈ సమావేశాన్ని విరూపింప చేసిన ఈ సమయములో గవర్నరుగారి
ఆదేశములో నేడు మన ప్రజానీకాన్ని ఎదుర్కొంటున్న వివిధ సమస్యలను వివరించి
వాటి పట్ల ఈ ప్రభుత్వముయొక్క విధానాలను (policies)ను సభ్యులకు తెలియజేసి
యందివ్వడం సభ్యులు ఈ సమావేశములోనే వాటిని తర్జిించి ప్రజాభిప్రాయాను
గుణ్యంగా తమ సలహాలను ప్రభుత్వానికి తెలిపుకొనే అవకాశము ఉండేది. సభ్యుల
యొక్క సూచనలను దృష్టిలో యంచునని తదనుగుణ్యంగా బడ్జెట్ ను తయారు చేసేం
దుకుగూడ ప్రభుత్వానికి వీలుగా యుండేది. ఈ సమావేశానికి ఖర్చుచేసిన డబ్బు
గూడ సద్వినియోగము చేసినట్లు అయి ఉండేది. ఇప్పుడు నామ మాత్రంగా గవర్నరు

[Sri S. Ramakrishniah]

[13th May 1952]

గారి ఆదేశమును విని ఆంగీకరించేందుకు ఈ సమావేశాన్ని ఏర్పాటుచేసి ఇంత ప్రజా ప్రవక్తము ఖర్చు చేయబడినది. ఇదంతయు నిష్ప్రయోజనమగుచున్నది. అందు చేత, గవర్నరుగారి ఆదేశములో ప్రభుత్వంయొక్క వివిధ పోలీసుల తెలిపి యుండవలసినది. కనుక అటువంటి సూచనలేవీవారి ప్రస్తావనలలో లేకపోవడం అనేది చాలా లోపంగా కనిపిస్తున్నదని నేను మనవిచేయుచున్నాను.

“గవర్నరుగారి ప్రస్తావనలలో ఎన్నికలుగురించి ఎన్నికలు చాలా సక్రమంగా జరిగాయని సూచించబడింది. ఈ ఎన్నికలు గురించి గౌరవనీయులగు విద్యార్థులు, మాతృలు ఉపన్యాసంలోగూడ అందులో ఎన్నికలు కొంతవరకు చాలా బాగుగా జరిగాయని చెప్పటంలో, కొన్ని కొన్ని చోట్ల సక్రమంగా జరుగలేదని ధ్వనిస్తున్నది. అయితే జనరల్ ఎన్నికలకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు అవి వివిధంగా జరిగినవోగాని, బహుశా సక్రమంగానే జరిగియుండవచ్చు. కాని కొన్నిల్ ఎన్నికలు మాత్రము విచిత్రము తప్పకరింగా జరగలేదని నేను గట్టిగా ఘంటాశబ్దంగా చెప్పగలను. కొన్నిల్ ఎన్నికలు విపద్ధతి ప్రకారము జరిగినది ఈ సభలో ఉన్న వారందరికీ తెలిసియున్నది. ఉపాధ్యాయ వర్గాల ఎన్నికలుగాని, ప్లానిక సంస్థల ఎన్నికలుగాని లేదా Graduates constituencies ఎన్నికలుగాని ఇవన్నీ కూడా ఎంత అక్రమంగా అన్యాయంగా జరుగబడినాయి, అనేటటువంటి విషయము నేను మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. జనరల్ ఎన్నికలలో అనుసరింపబడిన వోటింగు పద్ధతి కొన్నిల్ ఎన్నికలకు అనుసరింపబడలేదు. జనరల్ ఎన్నికలలో రహస్యపు (secret voting) వోటింగు విధానము అనుసరింపబడినది. అంతేకాకుండా బ్యాలెట్ పేపరులను అభ్యర్థులుగాని, వారి తరఫున నియమించబడిన ఏజెంట్లుగాని, ఇతరులుగాని ముట్టనవకాశములేకుండా, అవి ఉంచబడినచోట్ల వాటికి పోలీసు రక్షణ ఇవ్వబడినది కాని కొన్నిల్ ఎన్నికలలో ఈ సక్రమ విధానములు అనుసరింపబడలేదు. ఈ ఎన్నికలలో వోటర్లకు బ్యాలెట్ పేపర్లు పంపబడి పోస్టల్ బ్యాలెట్ విధానాన్ని అనుసరించినందున ఎంతో అక్రమానికి అన్యాయానికి దారి గలిగినది. వోటర్లకివ్వబడిన బ్యాలెట్ పేపర్లు, చాలా చోట్ల అభ్యర్థులు (candidates) చేతికి వట్టి సంతకాలతో అట్లనే ఇవ్వబడినవి. న్యాయంగా అభ్యర్థులు బ్యాలెట్ పేపర్లను అసలే ముట్టుకొనకూడదు. కాని చాలా మంది అభ్యర్థులు వోటర్ల వగ్గరనుండి బ్యాలెట్ పేపర్లు ఇప్పించుకొని తామె స్వయంగా గవర్నమెంటు ఆఫీసులకు అందజేశారు. ఈ విధంగా ముఖ్యంగా మార్చి 16 వ తేదీనాడు జరిగినటువంటి అన్యాయము ఊహించుటకు సాధ్యంగాదని మనవిచేయుచున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఉపాధ్యాయవర్గాలగురించి మనవి చేయుచున్నాను ఎప్పుడైతే బ్యాలెట్ పేపర్లు ఉపాధ్యాయులకు పోష్టులో పంపబడినవోలేదో, వెంటనే అనేకమంది అభ్యర్థులు మ్యానేజీమెంట్లు ప్రతి స్కూలుకు వెళ్లి అక్కడి ఉపాధ్యాయులయొక్క బ్యాలెట్ పేపర్లలో కేవలం సంతకాలు మాత్రము పెట్టించుకొని తీసుకొనిపోయినారు. ఈ విషయంలో అనేక నిదర్శనాలు ఉన్నాయి. పులికలలో ప్రకటించినటువంటి నిదర్శనాలు కూడా వున్నాయి. ‘అభ్యర్థులు మా బ్యాలెట్ పేపర్లలో సంతకాలు మాత్రము వుచ్చుకొని తీసుకొనిపోయినారు. మా వోట్లు ఎవరికిచ్చామా అని మాకే తెలియకుండా ఉందని ఉపాధ్యాయులు చెప్పినారు’. ఈ విషయము విమత్రము సత్యమార్పిడి కాదు. దీనికి అంతయు కారణము పోస్టల్ బ్యాలెట్ పద్ధతే అని చెప్పవలసి యుండుంది. ఈ పద్ధతిలో దైవికమైన అన్యాయాలు జరిగేటందుకు అవకాశముండుంది గనుకనే, ఈ పద్ధతి మంచిది కాదు, రహస్యబాలెట్ విధానాన్ని అమలు జరుపవలెనని ఉపాధ్యాయుల పక్షమున ఉపాధ్యాయ సంఘాల పక్షమున అనేక విధములైనటువంటి విజ్ఞాపనలు ఎన్నికలకు ఎంతోముందుగానే ప్రభుత్వానికి పంపబడినకూడా ప్రభుత్వము వాటిని చెవిని పెట్టలేదు. ఈ విధంగా

13th May 1952]

[Sri S. Ramakrishniah]

ప్రజాస్వామిక పద్ధతులకు వ్యతిరేకంగా ఎన్నికలు జరిగి, దాని పర్యవసానము అనుభవించే అవస్థ ఏర్పడినది.

“తరువాత, క్రింది తరగతి ఉద్యోగస్థులయొక్క జీతములగురించి కొంత మనవి చేయుచున్నాను. ఉపాధ్యాయులకును య్.జి.ఓ. లకును ప్రభుత్వం యిస్తున్నటువంటి జీతాలు ఎంత తక్కువగాయన్నవో అందరికిని తెలిసినదే. ఉపాధ్యాయులు య్.జి.ఓ. లే కాదు. మీనియర్స్ (peons) మొదలగువారి జీతాలు చాలా హీనంగా ఉన్నాయి. వారు దినమంతా పనిచేస్తున్నప్పటికీ, వారికిచ్చే జీతాలు మాత్రం వారి అవసరాలకు విమాత్రము చాలనటువంటివి. ఉదాహరణంగా, ఈ సమావేశములో ఉదయం 8 గంటలనుండి సాయంత్రము 8 గంటలవరకు పనిచేస్తున్నటువంటి జవాన్లకు ఎంత జీతము యిస్తున్నారో అందరికి తెలిసినదే. వారికి 18 రూపాయలు జీతమని, 18 రూపాయలు కరువు అలవెన్సు అని, మరో 7 రూపాయలు ఇంటి అలవెన్సు అని అంతా కలిసిన 43 రూపాయలే ఇస్తున్నారు. ఆ కొద్ది జీతము వారి కనీస అవసరాలకైనా వివిధంగా సరిపోతుందో ప్రభుత్వమున్నూ, సభ్యులున్నూ ఆలోచించవలసి యున్నది. నామాన్యంగా 4, 5 గురు మంది ఉండేటటువంటి కుటుంబాలుగలవారికి ఈ జీతము చూట గంజికైనా చాలదని చెప్పితే ఆశ్చర్యమేమీ లేదు. వారికి ఒక చూటకైనా చాలినంత ఆహారములేక దేహమంతా తుష్కించి, శరీరములో రక్తమాంసాదులు లేక, కండ్లు లోపలికి దిగి, కేవలము జీవచ్ఛవములవలే కనవిస్తున్నారు. వచ్చే నాల్గు రాళ్లనుండి కుటుంబాలు పోషించవలెనుంటి దుర్భర జీవితాన్ని భరించలేక ఆత్మహత్యలు చేసుకొన్నటువంటి నిదర్శనాలుగూడా మనము వింటున్నాము. పత్రికలలో గూడ ప్రకటింపబడుతూ ఉంటుంది. ఈ సందర్భమున అమలాపురములో జరిగినటువంటి ఒక ఘోర సంఘటనను మనవిచేసి వట్లయితే వృథాయము కరిగి నీరసపోతుంది. ఒక హైస్కూలు ఉపాధ్యాయుడు ఒక దినము ఇంటిలో బియ్యము లేకపోతే ఆ దినము సాయంత్రము భార్య మెడలోని తాళిని అమ్మి ఎక్కడ నుంచో బయటనుండి కొంత బియ్యాన్ని పట్టుకొని వస్తుయండగా, మధ్యన పోలీసులు ఆతనిని పట్టుకొని బ్లాక్ మార్కెట్టు అనే నేరముక్రింద టైప్ నుకు తీసుకొని వెళ్లి చూట లాగుకొని వకలి పెట్టారు. ఇంటివద్ద ఆకలితో చాచురమనే బిడ్డలు దిగుబులో కృసించి, బక్కచిక్కిన భార్య బియ్యంకొరకు ఎదురుచూస్తున్నారు జరిగిన విషయం తెలుపగానే గొల్లమని విచ్చారు. అది భరింపరాని దృశ్యం. పిల్లలు ఏడ్చి ఏడ్చి నిద్రపోయారు. భార్య కూడా—పాపం మధ్యాహ్నం ఎంగిలిపడిందో లేదో శోషతో తలవాల్చింది. యజమానికి మాత్రం నిద్రపట్టాలా. ఈ దుర్భర పరిస్థితిని భరింపలేక ఆ రాత్రి కొంత నేపటికి అందరు నిద్రపోయినదిరువాత దొడ్డిలోకి పోయి భావిలో పడి ఆత్మహత్యచేసుకొన్నాడు. ఈ లాంటి నిదర్శనాలు అప్పుడప్పుడు వింటూనేయున్నాము. కనుక ఇటువంటి విషయాల్నిపిటిని ప్రభుత్వమువారు కరుణార్థిహృదయంతో గమనించి పరిష్కరించవలసి యుంటుంది. ప్రస్తుతము య్.జి.ఓ. లకు 45 రూపాయలు జీతము క్రిందను, 22 రూపాయలు కరువు అలవెన్సు క్రిందను మొత్తము 67 రూపాయలు ఇస్తూ యున్నారు. అదే విధంగా ఒక ప్రాథమిక ఉపాధ్యాయునికి 50 రూపాయలు ఇస్తూ యున్నారు. ఇది వారికి కనీస అవసరాలకైనా వివిధంగా పరిపోతుందని రెక్కచేయవలసి ఉంటుంది. కనుక నేను ప్రభుత్వాన్ని, సభ్యులను కోరునదేమనగా, ఒక ఉపాధ్యాయునకు, అతని అవసరాలకు కనీసము ఎంత డబ్బు కావలసియుంటుందో బియ్యానికి ఇంతయని, బట్టకు ఇంతయని, ఇంటి వాడుగకు ఇంతయని, ఈ విధంగా అతని అవసరాలకు కావలసిన డబ్బును రెక్కపెట్టి ఒక ఉపాధ్యాయుని బడ్జెట్ ఏర్పాటుచేసి దాని ప్రకారం ప్రభుత్వ బడ్జెట్ ను తయారు చేయవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను అదే విధంగా ఒక

[Sri S. Ramakrishniah]

[13th May 1952]

య.జి.ఓ. యొక్క బడ్జెట్‌ను తయారుచేసి ఆ ప్రకారము ప్రభుత్వ బడ్జెట్‌ను సవరించవలసియుండును. అదే మాదిరిగానే మీనియర్స్ విషయంలోనూ వారి ఖర్చును లెక్క కట్టి దాని ప్రకారం వారికి జీతాలిచ్చేటట్లు ప్రభుత్వ బడ్జెట్ తయారు చేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నదని మనవిచేస్తూ హౌస్‌ను వ్యతిరేకిస్తూ ఇంతటితో విరమించుకొంటున్నాను.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I think we have had a sufficient number of speeches. I am afraid I cannot call on any more members to speak. I will now call upon Mr. Adityan to speak.”

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY :—“ I am the mover of an amendment and I asked for an opportunity to speak twice the other day and also to-day, but I have not yet had a chance.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I suggest a general discussion on all the amendments.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I can give only five minutes to the hon. Member.”

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, the fact that I have been granted only a short time, and that it has become necessary for the Chair to give me only a short time, is, I think, a good augury that the problem of the teachers is going to be solved in a short time.

“ Now, Sir, I have given notice of an amendment that there has been a serious omission in His Excellency's Address regarding the steps that are intended to be taken by the Government to ameliorate the condition of the teachers. I say, Sir, that this is not a demand from the members of a particular profession, the teaching profession, but it is a demand from the public, inasmuch as the teacher is after all in *loco parentis* and the duty the teacher has been discharging in the school is nothing but the duty of the parent done for the nation. If the Government gather the families of the lakh and thirty thousand elementary school teachers in one concentrated area, it will be clearly seen that the lot of these one lakh and thirty thousand families of elementary school teachers is, as bad as, if not worse than that of, the people affected by the Rayalaseema famine. But the only point of difference is that these teachers are scattered. They are dying, dying every inch, every moment; they are half-clad, ill-housed and half-fed. And, if these lakh and thirty thousand families are given a living wage, then Indra, the God of Gods, Indra, the king of kings, will be really glad that the Chief Minister in the position of a king in Madras, has done something right and then he will make rains shower like anything.

“ Then, Sir, these teachers, a lakh and thirty thousand of them, have not had any opportunity to voice forth their feelings all along. As a Member elected from the teachers' constituency, I ask, can the teacher be anything otherwise than famine-stricken if he is paid Rs. 27 plus Rs. 19 or Rs. 46, which is less than what a

13th May 1952] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

menial in Government service gets? Is this the way in which the moulder of the nation, who by teaching history contrary to the slavish way indicated in the books produced great men who won freedom for the country, and who is still there teaching history in the proper way to preserve the hard-won freedom, should be treated? Is that moulder of the nation to be treated worse than a menial in this country even after five years of Swaraj? Can the teacher be anything worse than famine-stricken if his children are not given free education, if priority in free education is not given to the children of the man who is actually engaged in teaching? Even the highest paid railway officers are given railway passes because they are running the railway. But, are not the teachers running the educational machinery? And, can the teacher be anything but famine-stricken if he is driven out into the streets in his 50th year or so after three months of divorce notice business, called contract, under the Educational Rules? It looks as if the higher the salary the lesser the security; the greater the experience the lesser the security. Can the teacher be anything otherwise than famine-stricken if he in his 55th year, after discharging his useful service for nearly 30 years, is driven out without pension, for the reason that he had been serving in a quasi-Governmental or aided institution? Can the teacher be anything else than famine-stricken if the caste and sub-caste system in the name of Agency is perpetuated? That might have been the case when the Britisher was here. There is a caste called the local board teacher with sub-castes of municipal, district board and panchayat teachers. Then, you have got the caste of teachers in aided institutions and Government institutions. Of course, I have no quarrel with these different names. But different names mean different salaries for men with the same educational qualifications, men with the same professional qualifications, men handling the same syllabus and teaching the same Indian children and inspected by the same Government officers. Then, Sir, these people are being discriminated against in a Secular State, which claims to give equality of opportunity to all. When are all these things to go, if they are not to go under the aegis of our able Chief Minister, Rajaji here? By one stroke of the pen the Hon. Chief Minister can take away this divorce business. I know the previous Education Minister promised to do that, but it has not been done. I say, Sir, that by one stroke of the pen the Hon. Chief Minister can do these and thus enable the teacher to discharge his primary function of teaching in contentment and peace in respect of his living wage and security of service. If these things are done by our able Chief Minister, I think, I can repeat what I said earlier in my speech that Indra will shower his blessings and the whole country will be blessed with prosperity."

* SRI P. N. MARTHANDAM PILLAI :—" Sir, I got up half-a-dozen times the other day and to-day, but as yet I am sorry I have not been able to catch your eye. I did not know you were

[Sri P. N. Marthandam Pillai] [13th May 1952]

asking for slips from Members wishing to speak. In fact, I did send my slip about an hour ago. If it is not inconvenient I would request you to give me an opportunity to speak to-day."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I did not ask for slips, though certain slips were sent to me and certain names also were given to me. As far as possible, I have accommodated most of the hon. Members. Of course, it is not possible for every Member to speak and we must come to the end of our business some time, somehow. So far, we have had a full day the day before and one half day to-day. But, if the hon. Member is particular, I shall certainly give him five minutes."

* SRI P. N. MARTHANDAM PILLAI :—" Mr. Chairman, Sir, the main motion before the House is a very simple one and, if I may add, it is a normal, formal vote. Those of the hon. Members who heard the speech of the Governor are anxious to say, ' We thank you, Sir, for the Address you have given.' Those of the Members who walked out possibly do not know what the Governor said and, therefore, they may say, ' We do not know what the Governor said and, therefore, we are not prepared to associate ourselves along with you.' Well, Sir, I will be content if you allow those who heard the Governor and who appreciated the Governor's Address to present an Address to him of thanks. It does not stop with that. The Members who have given notice of amendments, accept the Motion of Thanks. I want you, Sir, to note it. The Members of the Opposition who have given notice of various amendments have accepted so far as the thanks part of the Motion is concerned, but they only added to it, ' but regret, ' etc. There are 23 such regrets in the amendments given notice of. I would only request you, Sir, to omit this chapter of regrets and pass only the Motion of Thanks. I thank you, Sir, for the opportunity given."

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" Mr. Chairman, the Motion before the House is to express our thanks to the Governor for the Address which he has been pleased to give us. Sir, the Address is a short one, a brief one, and the Governor has shown very commendable economy in words and I only wish he had shown equal economy in another direction, in the direction of his salary and emoluments. Out of public funds, something like 10 lakhs of rupees are spent for the purpose of pomp, paraphernalia and the staff of the Governor. While there are persons in the employ of the Government drawing Rs. 18, is it right that the Head of the State should draw ten lakhs of rupees per annum towards his salary and allowances alone . . ."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The figures are all wrong."

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" I believe it is about 10 lakhs or so. (Interruption.) Very well, Rs. 7,20,000. Now, Sir, I ask what justification is there for spending such a large sum?

13th May 1952]

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

Let us assume that, in this year's budget, they have provided for Rs. 7 lakhs. Even then it does not reduce the force of my argument that it is out of all proportion to the average income of the people of this State. I do not, of course, deny the great service that the Governor has done to the party to which he belongs and if he is to be paid for his services to the party, then that money should come out of party funds and not out of public funds. I know that this matter is under correspondence—I mean the subject of reduction of the salary of the Governor—between the State Government and the Central Government. I know how official correspondence takes time—it may be months, it may be years, before the decision is taken. In the meantime, I would appeal to the Governor to make a voluntary reduction and a substantial reduction, so that it may be agreeable to the vast bulk of the people in the State. Sir, if he wants the respect and regard of the people . . .”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“I rise to a point of order. Sir, I do not think that the discussion should be prolonged in this manner. I do not see the end of it and if it is to go on in this manner, I raise a point of order that the subject cannot be discussed in this Legislature.”

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN:—“Sir, I anticipated this point of order, because I know the Hon. Chief Minister is living in the last decade. It has been already ruled that, after the new Constitution, this subject can be discussed, but the only thing which we cannot do is to vote on it.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—“That is the point.”

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN:—“It was in the olden days, that is during 1937-39, this subject was kept out of discussion, but now we are under the new Constitution and so it is open to full discussion.

“Now, Sir, I was saying that, if the Governor wishes to have the respect and regard of the people of the State and if he wants to justify his existence as the Governor of this State, he should voluntarily reduce this huge drain on public funds and thus save money, so that the people at large may have the benefit of it.

“Sir, in the Address for which we are asked to thank the Governor, mention is made about the food and famine situation in the State. The Address says, ‘Gruel centres have been opened, in large numbers and free gruel is served to infirm and disabled persons and to women and children.’ It is stated as the Government policy that the gruel, for what it is worth, is given to the infirm, to the disabled and to women and children. What about the able-bodied person who is unemployed? I read an extract from the *Indian Express*, dated 12th February 1952, in which it is stated that the Food Minister of the Central Government, Mr. Munshi, came and toured the areas affected by famine. He visited various gruel centres . . .”

[13th May 1952]

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—"Gruel centres or cruel centres?"

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—"Gruel centres. It appeared in that paper that the gruel supplied in some of the centres was bad. In fact, in one of the gruel centres, the Hon. Mr. Munshi saw hundreds of persons clamouring for the little gruel, the colour of which was red. He thought he could taste it, and it appeared in the press that the Hon. Food Minister tried to taste the gruel and put it into his mouth but he could not get it down his throat.

1-15
p.m.

"That shows the quality of the gruel supplied. It is reported that Mr. Munshi proceeded to a nearby village where he got an able-bodied man removed from the gruel centre saying that he objected to such people being fed at the gruel centres. Here is a case of an able-bodied person not being allowed to take the gruel from the gruel centre. If he has no employment, what does the Government want him to do? Are the Government refusing to give him gruel, so that he may starve, get diseased, become decrepit and thus become disabled and then come under the benefit of the gruel supply scheme? Is that the policy of the Government? When will the Government accept the responsibility for providing employment for the people? If you read the U.D.F. programme, you will find we have accepted the responsibility to provide employment to every adult of the State. That is one of the basic principles of any civilized Government in the world, let it be a Communist Government, or a Capitalist Government. Are this Government prepared to accept the responsibility of providing employment or adequate relief to the people? I require an answer from the Hon. the Chief Minister and I hope that, when he replies, he will categorically say that the Government accept the responsibility of providing employment or adequate relief to the people, every adult man and woman in the State.

"There is an appeal in the Address for sound traditions being established. In this connexion, I wish to state that it gives me no pleasure to criticize the Hon. the Chief Minister. I find persons, not merely his followers but devotees, saying that the Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari can do no wrong and one of the hon. Members went to the extent of saying that if what he does is not in accordance with law, then the law must be wrong. I have no quarrel with such devotees, but I have also a duty to perform, an unpleasant duty to perform, the duty of pointing out the misdeeds of the Government, just as the Government Members have got to sing his praise; otherwise, I will not be worth my salt. The Hon. the Chief Minister has come into the ring and he cannot plead he is old. How I wish he had retired in glory! Many a boxing champion, Joe Louis, Max Baer and Max Schmelling and others did not know when to retire from the ring and every boxer goes again and again into the ring only to retire in shame. If the Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari had desisted from coming into the ring, it would not be necessary for me to hit him as I have to do to-day with regret."

13th May 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—I do not mind your hits."

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN:—I am glad the Hon. the Chief Minister does not mind hits. I may not say that again because it is only my sense of duty that eggs me on to do this unpleasant duty of pointing out the wrongs and misdeeds committed by the Government under his charge. The first wrong thing, the first mistake, as has been pointed out again and again is his nomination to this council under Article 171 (5). While replying in the other House, he dexterously avoided referring to this Article and he proceeded as though the criticism was with reference to Article 164. He imagined that we, on this side of the House, were accusing him for having gone against Article 164. If he had been nominated as a Minister under Article 164, I will have no quarrel with him because he will have to stand for election, if not now, within six months from the date of his appointment as Minister, but we take strong exception to his nomination under Article 171 (5). This is what that Article of the Constitution says :

' (5) The members to be nominated by the Governor under sub clause (a) of clause (3) shall consist of persons having special knowledge or practical experience in respect of such matters as the following, namely :—

Literature, science, art, co-operative movement and social service.'

In other words, this Article provides for nomination of certain experts, experts in literature, experts in science, experts in art, experts in the co-operative movement and experts in social service. I daresay the Hon. the Chief Minister was not nominated for the reason that he is an expert scientist, or an expert artist, or an expert in literature or social work. For his nomination, there were other reasons, which the country knows. And while getting himself nominated what is it that he has done? He has taken the chance from out of a man to whom the nomination is rightfully due; this nomination ought to have gone to some educationist, dramatist or artist and so long as he retains this seat, I fear, Sir, he is grabbing the seat and retaining it to the exclusion of one of whom it is legally and morally due. There are able artists who are worth appointing who have not come into the Council. For example, there is Mr. N. S. Krishnan, the able actor and dramatist; he has not been appointed and there are so many journalists left out and it is a pity that the Hon. the Chief Minister has put himself in their position. In justification of retaining his seat and his membership of the Council, the Chief Minister said that if he were younger, he would stand for election and contest a seat. Now, his willingness to stand for election is cancelled by the phrase 'if I were younger'. One of the Members on the Government benches mentioned the story of Markandeya. If there is any method of preserving eternal youth—I do not know the method—if there is any elixir of life, I will gladly hand it over to the Chief Minister in order to make him stand for election."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I am not prepared to accept a prescription from the hon. Gentleman."

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[13th May 1952]

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ I should like to ask, Sir, if the mere fact of advanced age is a bar to stand for an election. Is that a real handicap? The only drawback of an aged person is that he cannot run about and he cannot make speeches. We know well how active the Chief Minister is. Were not persons put up for election who were under greater handicap? Were there not people who were put in prison and asked to contest the elections? Were there not people who contested the elections with warrants of arrest hanging over their heads, and with charges of conspiracy against the Government pending against them; were there not people who contested the elections while they were running about with warrants pursuing them? Were there not people who contested the elections while they were actually bed-ridden? That being so, why not the Hon. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari contest the elections?

“ The time given to me is very short and I will have to refer to one or two things more before I close. At the time the Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari took up office, it was widely said that he was undertaking the cleansing work; public life in the State had become dirty, there were nepotism, corruption and bribery and he was going to eradicate them. That was what was said. But how did he eradicate nepotism? The word is derived from ‘nephew’; if a person appoints one who is related to him or his friend, then that is nepotism; if a person appoints his nephew, it is nepotism; if someone close to the appointing person is appointed, then that is nepotism, it may be a friend or a relative. How did the Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachari eradicate nepotism, Sir? The very first appointment that he made, the Secretary to the Legislature here, how was it filled? By a person known to him. Mr. R. V. Krishna Ayyar was appointed as Secretary to the Legislature; it is a key appointment. In that connexion, I will have to ask, Sir, ‘Were applications called for, were they scrutinized, and was the opinion of the Public Service Commission invited?’ No, Sir. The only qualification which is known to the outside world is that the candidate knew the Chief Minister personally; otherwise, what is the justification for appointing a person to the service 13 years after he had retired and what is the justification to bring him back? Did he apply for the post? What are his qualifications? Did he produce a medical certificate? Were there not other applicants and what did the Public Service Commission say about it? You say, Sir, that it is a temporary appointment and you call it temporary for the purpose of appointing a person who is known to you and who did some service which was pleasant to you for these twelve years. That is why he has been appointed without calling for applications and without consulting the Commission. I say, Sir, that this will go down in history as one of the outstanding examples of nepotism and if it is how you are going to cleanse this State of nepotism then I know what the fate of this State will be. I ask the Hon. Chief Minister, ‘While you are here to stamp out corruption, what about the huge organized corruption which is going on, the gift of ten acres of land to people because they

13th May 1952]

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

happen to be members of the Congress Party, in order to enable them to continue their support to you? What justification is there to continue this grant of land to 10,000 persons?' I ask the Hon. the Chief Minister to examine every case; there are Ministers who have been given lands and in every case of the grant of such lands, it is the poor cultivator who was in possession of the land, who has been dispossessed and whose livelihood has been taken away from him. The lands have been distributed and the previous cultivators lost their livelihood, so that your party can run this Government and you can have the support of these people. Is it not corruption and if it is not, I ask, what else is corruption? In the U.D.F. programme, the first and the foremost thing is that such lands will be confiscated and they will be restored to the original owners, the cultivators who must have their means of livelihood.

"In reply to the criticism that had been made regarding the absence of any policy in the Address, the retort came: 'What is the difficulty, the Congress policy is there.' If you are going to pursue the Congress policy, I would like to remind you, what the verdict of the people was on the Congress policy? What was the Congress policy with regard to food? You levied sales tax on food and even on salt. Mahatmaji fought against salt tax and you are retaining it in the shape of sales tax and the sales tax on food and salt alone comes to Rs. 7 crores. Each individual in the State, however poor he may be, will have to buy his food and salt and he will have to pay the tax. When the question was raised, the Hon. Mr. Gopala Reddi said that though it was hard on the poor, yet it was his *kamadhenu*. But he was defeated in the elections and is not here, and yet you say that that is the policy which has the support of the people. Regarding Prohibition, you are going to continue it as the last Government did. The last Government wanted several lakhs of rupees for the purchase of muskets, revolvers and handcuffs for the enforcement of Prohibition, and you are supporting the enforcement of Prohibition with muskets, revolvers and handcuffs. You are also continuing the same old policy with regard to the Armed Police and Rs. 2 crores per year are being spent on that account. If you are going to continue the same old policy, that only shows that you have not learned any lesson from the last general elections. Where are the Ministers who wanted imposition of taxes on food and salt and the maintenance of the Armed Police? They have not been returned; Sri Gopala Reddi is not here and the former Chief Minister is not also here. But one thing is plain, Sir, and it is that the drama is the same, but only the actors are different. Sir, I shall be finishing in a few minutes.

"Then, Sir, it was said that the policy of the present Government is to declare war against all Communists, A to Z. I say with all respect to the Hon. Chief Minister, 'If that is your policy, you do not know the people. The very name of Communism may be abhorrent to you; the very name of Communism may be abhorrent to your Ministers.'"

1-30
P.m.

[13th May 1952]

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—“ No chance of war for the next two years.”

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ Perhaps the Hon. Ministers, the Rajah of Ramnad, the Rajah of Kapiyeswarapuram and Mr. Palaniswami Gounder may think that there is a general hatred against the Communists in the land. Sir, let me tell them, ‘ You are sadly mistaken, you have all lost contact with the people.’ Those who are well-off hate Communism. But those who work in the fields, those who work in the factories, those who work day in and day out to eke out their daily bread, the common man, and the middle classes, do not hate the Communists. Only those who go to dinner parties, garden parties and attend dancing parties—it is only they who fret and foam in their mouths and get red in their eyes at the mere mention of the Communists. But, what about the person who toils in the field for his daily morsel of food who does not know wherefrom he will get his food for the morrow? He does not hate Communism. You, Sir, say, ‘ War against all Communism, War against all Communists.’ I tell you, such a device to cause a split among other political parties will have no result. If war against all Communism is to be declared, I say it is a war against all the people in the land belonging to the other political parties who have joined the United Democratic Front. So, if you declare war against all Communism, it means war against all those persons. I know you, the Hon. the Chief Minister, have got every advantage on your side. I know you have the Public Safety Act, you have the power to start proceedings under Section 144, Cr.P.C. Now, you have found another mighty weapon, namely, action under the privilege of the House. Besides these, you have other repressive laws. But, in this war against Communism, the people will win. I tell you, the people who are leading a bitter life to-day, it is they who will win in this war. I tell you, people want happiness, not through prayer, not through devotion to divinity but through an abundance of wealth—happiness not through doping the mind, but through an abundant supply of material goods required for their daily needs. That is the only way in which any Government should improve the lot of the people and not by asking them to pray. Sir, I have no hesitation in asking the House to reject the motion.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The House will now rise for lunch and meet again at 2-30 p.m.”

(After lunch —2-30 p.m.)

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I had intended to wind up this debate on a note which might be called quiet and sweet. Unfortunately, Mr. Adityan has not permitted me to do so. Mr. Adityan, who has, I take it, got into this House on the vote of 12 or 15 gentlemen of the Lower House, advises me, in the first place, to retire and to stick to my retirement, and tells me that I was wrong in having come into

13th May 1952]. [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

the arena of leadership of the House and of my party, and asks me to reply to those observations. Anything that is said here by any Member is intended to be taken note of and to be replied to. Surely, Sir, we were not used to be asked to touch upon matters of this kind in a debate here or in any legislature, as to whether I should retire or not, whether I should bid good-bye to politics. These are matters, generally considered private, and however quasi-public the objects may be, they are not generally considered matters for debate and discussion. Since I am asked by Mr. Adityan to consider his proposal, I have to say, that when 100 or 150 odd members approached and pressed me to come out and preside over their work, I had pressed the very same argument and told them almost the same thing that Mr. Adityan had said to me. But it was not to be; and if I agreed, it is not as if any of the reasons, such as Mr. Adityan imagines was at the back of my mind. I agreed for totally different reasons, which even if I expatiate upon, I fear, will not be understood by Mr. Adityan. (Laughter.)

“The hon. Member, Mr. Adityan tells me also that I should go and stand for election. I said that I would have done a certain thing, had I been younger. He says that he would help me to do it by giving me necessary medicines for the purpose of being younger (laughter). Barring the temporary youth, which Mr. Adityan's attacks on me and my work give me for the moment, I do not think I can trust his ability to prescribe medicines. I hardly trust his capacity to work in politics. How can I trust his powers to treat ills of the human body, much less to make old people young! (Laughter.) Mr. Adityan has spoken in a manner which if it had been a brief interruption would have resulted in a counter interruption. But he has made such a long speech in the same strain that the shock became a rather chronic affair, and so I could not but allow him to go in the way he did. Mr. Adityan is connected with, I think he does actually edit, manage, and control, the policy of a chain of papers, for which he has earned justly, I think, a particular reputation for accuracy and decorum. (Laughter.) He has maintained that level on the floor of this House also. (Laughter.) Sir, it is exhilarating to attempt to do good to poor people around one. It is exhilarating, whether we fail or not, to be engaged in tasks which might help the fortunes of the poor people of our country. But the processes through which we have to go in order to be able to do that service as a Government, are unfortunately of a very unpleasant character. But, one cannot help it. If I get into a coal mine I cannot complain that the soot attaches to my clothes or face or hands. I shall, therefore, not feel delicate in dealing with matters dealt with here. I cannot afford to be delicate.

“At an early stage of the debate, Mr. Burra Subrahmanyam expressed his opinion of me. I shall not express my opinion of him. (Laughter.) Mr. Adityan said.—I am sorry, I have to deal with Mr. Burra Subrahmanyam a little longer. (Laughter.) He brought to the notice of the House my faults—of ability and of

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13th May 1952]

character. Well, I at once proceed to confess that all of us including myself have many faults, many defects, and let me hope that those who come after me to guide the destinies of this State and to advise the people of this country, may be better than I, better qualified than I, more able than I and of a better character. It is my fervent hope and trust that the tone of the people who will take charge of affairs will be better and better as the times go on. I do not mind confessing that I have many faults and that I wish I were much better than what I am. But let me assure Mr. Burra Subrahmanyam that he does not know me. (Laughter.) I do not know him either. I know his wife's father and his wife's mother and her mother and her father and all of them. (Laughter.) But I do not know him. The short experience I have had of him here compels me to make one observation, which, he will forgive me for making; the founder leaders of the party to which he is now affiliated in this election, would not have been happy to hear what he said. They are some of my old friends, old comrades and respected comrades. I do not mind what he said. For this is a coal mine I have got into, as I said earlier, and I do not mind the soot around me.

"Going now to what was said here in the debate, I must necessarily deal with more or less, what I may call, matters extraneous to the particular debate. Mr. Adityan spent a great deal of the time allotted to him in referring to the Secretary's appointment. As I already said, Mr. Adityan does not care very much for accuracy or even for diligent inquiry about matters of which he, for the time being, is not well informed, because he has got into the habit of his daily paper . . . (Laughter.)

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—"Sir, I rise on a matter of personal explanation. I sent questions on this subject as early as the 24th of last month and the rules provide that such questions should be answered within seven days of their receipt. But, still the questions have not been answered."

2-45 P.M. * THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Let me at once assure my friend, Sir, that I have not seen those questions. If they had not reached me, the delay must be due to some error in form or to some other cause. If I had seen them I would have hastened to answer them and would not have given a chance to the hon. Member for raising the point in this House.

"With regard to the Secretary's appointment, let me point out to the House that Mr. Adityan suggested that the gentleman who had been appointed Secretary to the Legislature is a kind of nephew of mine according to the definition which he gave at full length. Let hon. Members understand that he does not belong to my family or to the sub-community or clan or group to which I belong. But that is irrelevant. What I wish to assure him is this. Before he was called to take up this appointment, I had directed the offer to be made to the gentleman who last acted and retired as the Secretary to the Legislature and who had been for

13th May 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

a long time in charge of the work of this House as Deputy Secretary. The gentleman who last retired as Secretary was in my opinion the only competent person to be recalled to take up the duty at the present moment. So, I had him asked. He has got a better job in a different field altogether and he would not think of such a proposal. So, I had to go one step backward. Mr. Adityan remarked that we did not refer the matter to the Public Service Commission. He is totally ill-informed. The Public Service Commission had the matter before it and I had its approval before I proceeded. Apart from all these, is it only forms that we should care for, or shall we be sensible men? I want to know whether it is good, wise or proper for us to appoint a gentleman selected from the Bar, who will be entering the precincts of the Legislature for the first time, and call upon him to discharge the duties devolving upon him with reference to forms, precedents, conventions and proprieties and the delicate and difficult tasks that arise in managing the affairs of a legislature composed of independent Members and groups and in which there prevail high passions almost amounting to acerbity. I wrote to the gentleman who had been selected for the office by the Public Service Commission. Let me again give information which generally is not given. But, since the propriety of my action has been challenged, I have to mention it. That gentleman warmly welcomed the recall of Mr. R. V. Krishna Iyer with all his experience in this office and said that he would be glad to work as his under-study for some time. He agreed to it as any gentleman who has commonsense and who wishes to do his work well would agree. This is a matter which Mr. Adityan thought he could raise in this House, although it had nothing to do with the Address.

"Then Mr. Adityan took up the policy under which some lands were given to political sufferers by the previous Government and described it as corruption. The one thing was nepotism and the other thing was corruption! The first thing I did as soon as I was asked to bear this burden was this. I said: 'Never mind the difficulties and sufferings we have gone through, the battle has not ended, the sufferings and sacrifices must continue. It is not possible for me to continue the policy of land assignment for political sufferers'. If a dam were built or broken, I could not suddenly change the policy. I have to begin it even as the boy who put his hand into the hole made in a dam in the Netherlands and averted the flood till other persons came and took charge of the danger. I cannot suddenly bring about cancellation of assignments and take the risk of suits and applications in Court with reference to the validity of my action. Let hon. Members remember that these assignments were made long ago and that many Members who are now sitting on the opposite side here as well as in the other House have taken assignments. Mr. Adityan may take off his fingers so that others might see his smile when I say this. If I proceeded to do anything which was not legal, or fool-proof, I would be exposing myself to a number of spits, comments, counter-comments, allegations and the like. Allow me to say that I do not like this policy.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[13th May 1952]

I was not the man responsible for that policy and I could not prevent it. The moment I came into office I said that this policy should not be continued and proceeded to do what was best in the circumstances. We cannot always go back on events. No man can undo what has been done. That is not only the lesson of history; that has been laid down as scientific fact in the law of Karma. We have to go through the effects of what has been done. If a bad name has been earned, whatever we may do, that bad name will continue and we cannot undo it. All that we can do is—and that is what I propose to do—to try to set that error right. Even before I began to do anything else connected with the Government, I had made my position on this point perfectly clear. And yet Mr. Adityan raises the question in this House! When his party also is living in a glass house, he cannot afford to throw stones. It is not quite safe. When we launch on propaganda, we do not generally check up calculations and we commit mistakes.

“ Most of the speeches made here, unfortunately in my humble opinion, smack far too much of propaganda. The debate on the Address has been converted into party propaganda. Every political party is entitled to do it. It is not a point of order I am raising; it is an explanation I am offering to many of the things that have been said. I must say that that is not the right way to help or co-operate in the carrying on of Government from the one side or the other. We are co-operating with one another whether we sit on the Opposition side or on the Ministerialist side. This is not the way to debate on the Address or the budget. We may take a holiday now and then and indulge in propaganda and mutual re-crimation to add the spice of variety to political life, provided we are sportsmanlike. It is not right to deal with a policy speech in a propaganda spirit for party purposes. I say this definitely for this reason. It was said that a number of things had not been done. We all admit it. But they cannot be done unless we begin. I propose that we should begin to do things one by one. Let us get along in a spirit of helpfulness. It is quite easy for Members led by Mr. Rajeswara Rao to say: ‘Look at this! teachers are not paid adequate salaries, coolies are not paid adequate wages, industries are not sufficiently helped, small industries are being squeezed out by big industries, jaggery is squeezed out by sugar, sugar is suffering because there is not enough cane, the cane-grower is not given a fair price for his produce. Look at the capitalist! their income is highly taxed—Mr. Rajeswara Rao did not say this last thing but I say it on his behalf, to complete his catalogue. He said that his party would set all these things right in six months. If Mr. Rajeswara Rao will permit me to give my view of the matter, if he and his party took charge of the Government for six months, I have no doubt that the entire scheme of the Government will be so changed that there would be no opportunity to make any complaint whatsoever. (Laughter.) There will be no opportunity for any one to analyse achievements or failures. I speak from history. Mr. Rajeswara Rao and his associates have not founded

13th May 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

the Communist Party; they have not planned the Communist policy here. Their policy has been taken from the books of another country, another people, another nation”

SRI C. RAJESWARA RAO :—“ We are not referring for everything to England.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The hon. Member will not refer to England; he will refer to something worse. (Laughter.)

“ I do not think that the Communist Party can achieve all that Mr. Rajeswara Rao says it will achieve. It is inherently impossible. It is possible to do certain things. Let me tell my hon. Friend that it is not possible to do all the things which have been referred to in this and the other House within six months or even six years.”

SRI C. RAJESWARA RAO :—“ What this Government could not do in five years has been done in China in two years.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ If Mr. Rajeswara Rao had been sitting in Opposition, as he is sitting now here, in China and said all that he said in this House, I know where he would be in China. I know what the Government of China have done. Quite a different list of things have been done. I do not wish to talk much about China.

“ Mr. Rajeswara Rao asked me to get inspiration from China. Let us get inspiration from China. What did China do with the Opposition party? Are we to do that with the Opposition here? It is not possible. The challenges which Mr. Rajeswara Rao, his party friends and allies can throw at me are easily answered. They are all based on the capacity to terrorise and enforce by physical force. I do not deny that what Mr. Rajeswara Rao wants to do may be good. But the means that he wants to adopt to do these things quickly as he proposes to do—are means which are not available and cannot be had in this country if we are true to ourselves.

“ Unless we employ the physical compulsion which the U.S.S.R. and China use, unless we have a dictatorship of a particular class for the time being—they want a classless society, but dictatorship of a particular class, for the time being, is an absolute pre-requisite for the pace which he asks me to take—it is not possible here.”

SRI C. RAJESWARA RAO :—“ On a point of order, Sir. I submit that the Hon. Chief Minister is taking the last chance every time, and he is bringing in so many theoretical issues. The other party also must be allowed to speak on the theoretical issues. Let the Hon. Chief Minister”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The suggestion which the hon. Member, Mr. Rajeswara Rao, makes is that he should have a right of reply. In a debate it is usual—let me

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[13th May 1952]

tell the hon. Member—for Government to reply. If he replies, I will have to reply to that also. There must be some termination to the debate. So, there has been a conventional order laid down from time immemorial, and that is the result of a Government being in power or the Opposition being in the Opposition. I am not surprised that he raised this point of order. He feels that I have made a point, and it has gone home. I am afraid, he cannot ask for the right to reply. If he replied, I must then reply to that, and there would be no end.

“ Another point that was touched upon again and again was that the Address was not long enough and that it did not cover enough points. I have already given the reason. The Address itself contains the reason why it does not cover much ground. I submit that it is a good reason and a commonsense reason, and a reason which does not deprive anybody of any rights. The reason is that we are meeting again when we will have the whole budget and the entire policy, more or less, for the whole year, will be before the House, and there will be enough opportunity to go through that policy. We will have a general debate, and we will have particular debates also at the time of the budget. Also, the Governor has stated that he will address the Legislature at the time. Though he may not be bound to address, he has said he will do it. Immediately following it, the whole ground can be covered, and there is absolutely nothing whatsoever of substance in the complaint that the present Address is short.

“ The hon. Member, Mr. Govinda Menon, began the debate in the House. He was sitting in front of me the other day, and I thought he was the Leader of the Opposition. But he simply took that place by chance, I take it. He said that the Address was remarkably short and had no parallel. I was able to find a King's speech in Parliament which was even much shorter, which totalled 65 words only, of which 30 words were a mere prayer at the end. Therefore, it is not quite correct to say that the Address delivered by His Excellency the Governor the other day on behalf of the Government takes first rank in brevity. There are briefer Addresses in Parliamentary literature. Apart from that, I have given my reasons why this Address was necessarily brief, unless indeed we wanted to copy again all our election propaganda, our boosts, our boasts, and our previous achievements and all that kind of thing, and make an election document and call it an Address of the Governor. That would have been improper. The Address at each session is intended to sketch the programme of that particular legislature at that particular session, and it has to give an opportunity for a review of the past and for a review of the proposals that are intended to be carried out in the legislature. Election propaganda can cover not only one year's programme, or a ten years' programme, but sometimes even a 50 years' programme. Following the dictates of commonsense, I submit that we were right in making this Address brief, and referring only to what has been done and what has been in the minds of most people at the time. I have nothing more to say on this point.

13th May 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

" Sir, I now proceed to the several remarks made by hon. Members. I am grateful to the House for the large number of proposals and suggestions that have been given in the course of the debate by various hon. Members, and I assure hon. Members that these suggestions and other details will be taken into account and will be considered by the Government when they shape their budget for the year, and when they shape their budget, if they are allowed to continue in office, for another year also. For all these suggestions—some of them very important and urgent—that were made, I express my gratitude.

" Teachers, especially, have spoken about their own grievances. It is natural and it is right. But may I, with all deference, point out the fact to them that in the Constitution we have provisions by which, as any one will see, all special constituencies have been abolished? We have no representatives for landlords. We have no representatives for planters, for tenants, for labour, and so on. If hon. Members will study the constitution of the legislatures, they will see that from top to bottom, all special constituencies have been abolished, deliberately. In the constitution of the Legislative Councils of certain States, including Madras, they have provided seats to which graduates can elect members and teachers can elect members. The object of that provision was not to create a special constituency for either graduates as such or for teachers as such. Representatives of teachers are not here to represent a special constituency. It is a temptation and a natural temptation too to think so. They spoke, as far as I could judge, as if their main function here were to ventilate the grievances of teachers. The grievances of teachers may be true. They may be important. But I take permission to explain that the teachers have been put down here as an electoral college in order that we may have their advice for the country as a whole and not about any particular interests. It is an enlightened constituency, unlike the adult suffrage constituency where, whether a man is literate or illiterate, he can vote. But the teachers' constituency is an enlightened constituency. When the question was raised it was felt that not only graduates should have it, but teachers of long standing and who sometimes taught even graduates, should have it. Therefore, a constituency was created by which the *Rishis* of the land, as was described by some one before, would have a fraction of the seats in this House. The teachers who are here should look upon themselves as teachers with a capital 'T', and as people who teach society, who teach the young ones of the country and bring them up, and who are interested in their character, welfare, ability, and in everything. Therefore, I would beg of the teachers to see that although they have a right like any other persons to represent any particular interest along with others, they should not only take interest in their own affairs but in the affairs of others also. But there should be no idea that they are here mainly as representatives of teachers. They are here having been elected by a very enlightened college of the electorate, and that is the important position which they occupy in this House. I have said this in order that there may be no progressive mistake about that point.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13h May 1952]

Then, Sir, if we go into what actually has been said by them, it is all true that we are poor. Not only the teachers, but every body is poor in our country. If, Mr. Chairman, my own view is of any importance, on this occasion, let me confess once for all that our country's finances cannot bear the weight of the administration that has been put upon our finances. The entire structure was invented for a police government. It is not possible for a Welfare State to bear the cost of the administration on the lines that it has been shaped. We are poor. How can we carry on the administration and all the details connected with it? It is not possible. But can I change it in one day? When I was young, many people in the district in which I was living were saying, 'What is the need for Collectors; let us abolish Collectors; What is the need for District Magistrates; let us abolish District Magistrates'. In fact people who travel in train may very well imagine that the guard is unnecessary and that the driver is unnecessary, because they do not see the driver working in the engine. They can say, 'Why do we want an engine driver and why do we want a guard? The train is going all right'. It is not possible to appraise the value of all the various units in the administration. But the totality of the weight is certainly unsuited to our finances and to our total national income, and even to our culture and civilisation. But what is the remedy? The only remedy is that we will have to trust one another. Let us not have so many people to sit down superintending so many other people. If I ask a man to light the lamp, it is necessary now that there should be another man to see that he does not neglect his duties. It is also necessary to appoint a third man so that these two people do not bribe one another. (Laughter.) Even if bribery is detected, the trial should be fair and just, and it is necessary to have an appeal against that judgment. Now, that is the structure into which we have grown. Mutual distrust has become our civilisation and our politics. Our finances cannot bear this burden of mutual distrust and the cost of it. I do not think that we can talk it out at a meeting like this. The whole structure has to be examined. But there is no time to examine. I am like the man who has to repair the motor car while going in the car. How am I to stop this car which cannot be stopped? It is a car which cannot be stopped and yet it must be repaired. God alone knows how it can be done. Hon. Members opposite can well retort by saying, 'Well, if you do not know, we will do it'."

SRI C. RAJESWARA RAO:—"If you do not know we will do it."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"How the hon. Member Mr. Rajeswara Rao will do it. I know. But I do not believe in 'liquidation'. (Laughter.) That is my only objection. Therefore, since we have to bear and forbear, to live without killing anybody, and without plunging the classes into dismay and distrust, we have to carry on with patience and forbearance with one another."

Ma, w13th May 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

" Sir, I shall say only this and end. This much has been said and will be said. After this sitting is over, I have no doubt propaganda will start that it is only the dictatorship of the working class that will save the country. It was said, when I stated that I was opposed to Communists, that I was wrong in imagining that the country would welcome it. It was said that people wanted the Communists, and that, therefore, I was wrong in opposing them. The hon. Member Mr. Adityan said that common people did not share my hatred of the Communists. Where did he see my hatred of Communists? I ask, Sir, where did he see my hatred of the Communists in what I said or in what I did? I do not hate Communists. That is not what I said. But the hon. Member Mr. Adityan is noted for accuracy! " (Laughter.)

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" The Hon. the Leader of the House said that the Communists were his enemy No. 1. That one statement is enough."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I stand by that. Having said that Communists are my enemy No. 1 and I am their enemy No. 1, I have no hatred in my mind towards them. In fact, the Leaders of the Communist Party were there when I made that statement. If any one could see their faces or understand their minds through their gestures or their reactions. I had no doubt in my mind that there was no feeling of hatred about it. I was quite frank and I thought that they were ready for the challenge. That was their attitude and they did not see any hatred. Unfortunately, Sri Prakasam cannot understand things outside the field of hatred. It is said that the people want Communists, that the people like Communists and that my hatred is not shared by them—let me put it in the Member's own words. Now if it be true that the people want Communists, I have said something which the Opposition should welcome. I say, I am against Communism. Why then should there be any nervousness about it? If that brings the country down against me, I can be dismissed in no time, which is the object of the Opposition. But, Sir, I know exactly what it means. They want only to make further propaganda. What I said was a plain matter of fact statement of my policy and my view. But the Opposition wants to make out to the people that Communism is good. By all means try to make it out, but it cannot be made out by simply saying that all the people are with the Communists. You will have to make out to the people that Communism is good before you can say that all the people are with Communists and that, therefore, the Chief Minister who is sitting here for fighting Communism should be sent away. It is possible; it may happen. I do not want it and yet if it happens, I go out and let the Communists rule the country. Let them rule and let people be happy. I do not mind. But if the people do not want it as I gather that they do not want, then why should Sri Adityan be nervous about my plain statement, inviting the wrath of the country against me?

3-15
p.m.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13h May 1952]

If that would invite the wrath of the entire country against me, why should Mr. Adityan reply to it in the Legislative Council? I am done for in the country and there should be an end of the matter. Well, Sir, it is all propaganda. I have no objection to propaganda, but I must expose that propaganda. That is all.

"I myself want a dictatorship of the working classes, but in a different sense. Nobody should dictate and oppress and take charge of everything and liquidate other sections. I want everybody to become a workman. I want everyone to belong to the working class and that is the kind of dictatorship that I want. Let us make everybody work and let everybody work honestly and well. Then that means that all are workers. Then there is no objection to the dictatorship of the working classes. Sri Adityan does not belong to the working classes." (Laughter.)

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—"I am a working-class man."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"Mr. Adityan's political history is well-known to me though it is not known to all people here. (Laughter.) It does not matter. I also work 18 hours a day, if I may say so. But there are all kinds of work—work in which there is a joy in itself and work which is unpleasant, which is hard, and which is tedious. Work which is pleasant in itself pays its own wages though you may call it work. I want everybody to share in all the unpleasant works of the country and bear them in proportion, and if by licence or by permission, other people have to work in a different capacity, let them work. If all India begins to work like that and if all Madras begins to work like that, I have no doubt that our finances will bear all the burden necessary for the Government. It is because people do not work that our national income is small, our administration is heavy, our resources are insufficient and you have a long catalogue of grievances which any political party can make use of against any other political party which is in power. The moment Sri Adityan sits here, I can bring a longer catalogue of grievances and if I want to bamboozle people, it can be done. Sri Rajeswara Rao has ruled a certain part of the country by certain methods but it would not do in a democracy. Sir, I ask the House to reject the amendments and adopt the original motion."

SRI M. SITARAMA DASS :—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have an opportunity to speak by way of right of reply. But I do not want to say anything more when Rajaji has given a good reply. Therefore, I request the hon. Members to accept my Motion unanimously."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"The Motion and all the amendments are before the House. Now I will take up the amendments one by one. Is Sri S. B. Adityan withdrawing his amendment or is he pressing it?"

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—"I am not withdrawing my amendment, Sir."

13th May 1952]

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ Is any other hon. Member, who has moved an amendment, withdrawing his amendment? (After a pause.) As no hon. Member is withdrawing his amendment, I shall put the amendments to the vote of the House one by one. The question is—

‘ Add the following at the end :—

“ but regret that your Government have failed to indicate any effective steps to alleviate the hunger, misery, distress and unemployment affecting the majority of the people of this State.” (Sri S. B. Adityan.) ’ ”

The amendment was lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ As the hon. Member, Sri Alexander Gnanamuttu, is not in his seat, his amendment is deemed to have been withdrawn. I will put the next amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ Add the following at the end :—

“ but regret to note that Your Excellency has not been advised by the Council of Ministers on the following urgent and vital problems that are confronting the people of the State :—

(i) Educational reforms so very important for the building of a sound society; and adoption of common scales of pay and service conditions of teachers working under various managements in the State;

(ii) miserable plight of teachers, N.G.Os. and other menial services that play an important role in the efficient running of the administration and the measures that are going to be adopted for raising their economic, political and social status;

(iii) guarantee of fundamental rights to all the services and repeal of all such G.Os. and circulars that are contrary to provisions of the New Constitution as is being agitated and demanded by several teachers’ and N.G.O. organisations of the State; and

(iv) appalling conditions that are prevailing in the schools to-day as a result of inadequacy of staff and accommodation, enhanced school fees, unsuitable text-books and the remedies for redressal ”. (Sri S. Ramakrishnaiah.) ’ ”

The amendment was lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The question is—

‘ Add the following at the end :—

“ but regret that nothing has been said about the steps intended to be taken to raise the pay and status of the starving teachers of this State ”. (Sri G. Krishnamurthi.) ’ ”

The amendment was lost.

[13h May 1952]

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The question is—

‘ Add the following at the end :—

“ but regret to express our entire dissatisfaction that your Government have failed—

(i) to uphold the principles of democratic system of Government;

(ii) to envisage the policies and programmes for the amelioration of the common man of rural areas and for the development of the State; and

(iii) to take any steps whatsoever for bringing pressure on the Central Government for the early formation of Linguistic States.” (Sri P. Seetharamayya.) ”

The amendment was lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The question is—

‘ Add the following at the end :—

“ but regret to find that Your Excellency's Council of Ministers does not propose to introduce any legislation upon vital problems affecting the people of this State and providing them with adequate food, clothing, shelter and employment.” (Sri V. Gurunandan Row.) ”

The amendment was lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The question is—

‘ Add the following at the end :—

“ but regret to note with disappointment—

(i) that no steps have been proposed regarding the adequate protection of the Fundamental Rights of the citizens guaranteed in the Constitution of India and for putting a stop to the repressive measures and the curtailment of Civil Liberties such as banning of meetings and processions, arresting and jailing of public workers using of repressive machinery against workers, peasants and other sections of people struggling for the redressal of their just grievances, in the name of law and order;

(ii) that no steps have been proposed to put a stop to the grabbing of the lands of the peasants and public and banjar lands, etc., by the Zamindars and their utilizing dubious methods for circumventing the provisions of the enactment for the abolition of Zamindaries;

(iii) that no steps have been proposed to protect the present rights of the peasants in the inams and to put an end to the inhuman exploitation of the peasants by the big inamdars once for all;

(iv) that no steps have been proposed for the redressal of the grievances of the peasants in the matter of procurement of the foodgrains and for the adequate supply of the foodgrains to the consumers at rates within their reach;

13th May 1952]

[Mr. Chairman]

(v) that the measures proposed to deal with the famine conditions in Rayalaseema and parts of other districts do not touch even the fringe of the problem and that no steps such as construction of major irrigation projects are proposed for the eradication of the problem of famines in the State once for all;

(vi) that no steps have been proposed for the solution of the urgent and vital problems of the workers and middle-class employees such as unemployment, high prices, low wages and salaries, etc.;

(vii) that no steps have been proposed for the meeting of the just and minimum demands of the agricultural labourers and Harijans such as adequate wages, free house-sites, granting of banjar lands for cultivation, and strict implementation of the enactment for the removal of the disabilities of the Harijans passed by the Madras Legislature; and

(viii) that no concrete steps have been proposed to protect the rights of minorities, especially the Muslims." (Sri C. Rajeswara Rao.) "

The amendment was lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The question is—

' Add the following at the end :—

" but regret to note that Your Excellency should have failed to inform the Legislature of the causes of its summons in so far as they relate to the entire period of the Session; and this House expresses its surprise and concern that Your Excellency should have postponed a clear indication of the contemplated legislative policies of your Government regarding several matters of vital and immediate interest such as food shortage, famine, land reform, prohibition, and the like." (Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam.) "

The amendment was lost.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I will put the main Motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

' That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor that the Members of the Madras Legislative Council thank His Excellency for the Address delivered to the Members of the Legislature on the 6th of May.' "

The motion was declared carried. Sri S. B. Adityan demanded a poll. The division bell was rung.

SRI M. P. GOVINDA MENON :—" On a point of order, Sir. One hon. Member is moving from one place to another."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" He is looking for his seat."

[3th May 1952]

The House divided as follows :—

Ayes.

1 The Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari.	22 Sri K. P. Yagneswara Sarmā.
2 Sri N. Ranga Reddi.	23 „ S. Chengalraya Chetty.
3 „ A. M. Allapichai.	24 „ T. G. Krishnamurthi.
4 „ C. Perumalsami Reddi.	25 „ N. Annamalai Pillai.
5 Dr. S. Muthulakshmi Reddi.	26 „ T. J. M. Wilson.
6 Srimathi R. S. Subbulakshmi Ammal	27 „ M. Satyanarayana.
7 „ S. Manjubhashini.	28 Janab Mahomed Usman.
8 Sri R. Nathamuni Reddy.	29 Sri V. Bashyam Ayyangar.
9 The Hon. Dr. M. V. Krishna Rao.	30 „ T. Purushothama Mudaliar.
10 Dr. C. Nathamuni Naidu.	31 „ P. N. Marthandam Pillai.
11 Sri S. O. S. P. Odayappa.	32 „ V. R. Ranganathan.
12 „ T. M. Dajvasikhamani Achariar.	33 „ V. Ramakrishna.
13 „ M. Ethirajulu.	34 „ E. H. Parameswaran.
14 „ G. Venkatachalam.	35 „ M. Harischandra Prasad.
15 „ V. Rangasami Naidu.	36 „ Pendyala Sree Ramachandra
16 „ M. Sitharama Das.	„ Venkata Krishna Ranga Rao.
17 „ M. P. Sivagnana Gramany.	37 „ R. Govindarajuu Naidu.
18 „ S. P. Sivasubramanya Nadar.	38 „ K. Balasubramanya Ayyar.
19 „ R. Venkatasubba Rao Chowdary.	39 „ N. Nallasenapathi Sarkarai
20 „ G. Venkata Reddi.	„ Mandradiar.
21 „ D. Venkata Rao.	40 „ A. Subramaniam.
	41 Srimathi J. Sitamahalakshmi.
	42 Mrs. M. N. Chubwala.

Noes.

1 Sri G. Krishnamurthi.	7 Sri V. Chakkarai Chetty.
2 „ C. Rajeswara Rao.	8 „ M. P. Govinda Menon.
3 „ B. V. Subrahmanyam.	9 „ S. Ramakrishniah.
4 „ V. Gurunandan Row.	10 Janab Syed Mahaboob.
5 „ T. Prakasam.	11 Sri P. Seetharamayya.
6 „ S. B. Adityan.	

Ayes 42; Noes 11.

The motion was carried.

V.—MOTION FOR ADMONITION TO A MEMBER FOR BREACH OF
PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE.

3-30 p.m. MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The next item on the Agenda is the Motion given notice of by the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have to fulfil an unpleasant task. It gives me no pleasure to make the Motion that I have given notice of. Sir, one has to do many things and sometimes unpleasant tasks form one's duty. The Motion that I have given notice of reads as follows :—

“ Whereas on the sixth day of May 1952, when the two Houses had assembled together for the purpose of listening to the Address of His Excellency the Governor under Article 176 (1) of the Constitution the hon. Member, Sri T. Prakasam, in deliberate disregard of all constitutional proprieties, rose and interrupted the proceedings by delivering a speech questioning the competence of His Excellency to address the Houses and casting reflections on his conduct as Governor of this State ;

And whereas by such indecorous and disorderly conduct, the hon. Member committed a breach of the privileges of this House and was guilty of a grave contempt ;

Now, therefore, this House hereby administers a stern admonition to the hon. Member for his misconduct.”

“ Sir, it would not be necessary”

13th May 1952]

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ Sir, I rise on a point of order. This resolution cannot be moved before this House as it is constituted to-day. The resolution refers to what was said before a Joint House consisting of this House and the Assembly. It was on that occasion that the Governor came there and a point of order was raised by me. I am submitting therefore that this resolution must be brought before the Joint House, in the same manner as the point of order was raised by me before a Joint House. It is a matter of ordinary commonsense—leave aside all constitutional positions, jurisdiction, law points and technicalities—that this matter should come up before a Joint House. I submit that it is really an insult to the very Governor for whose sake the Leader of the House seems to have made this motion. As I said already, the Joint House to which the Governor delivered his Address, consisted of the Members of this House and also the Members of the Assembly. In the fitness of things, this resolution ought to have been brought before a Joint House. Instead of doing that, the Leader of the House has considered it fit to bring this resolution before this House, because he perhaps felt that the House as it is constituted to-day was in his favour, and would vote in his favour. No such presumption should be made by the Leader of the House, whatever might be the composition of this House. No such presumption should be made even by me a person who is affected by this resolution. This House has come into existence under the charter of the Constitution which says that this House has got certain duties to fulfil. It is in connection with the discharge of those duties that you became the Chairman of this House and you are in charge of this House conducting the proceedings day-to-day. So far as this matter is concerned, it cannot be placed before this House and we cannot ask for the opinion of this House alone. I should have expected the Hon. Leader of the House to concede this much, namely, that it is not proper to break up the Joint House in this manner. It is before the Joint House consisting of the Members of this House and the Assembly, that the so-called offence—if it is an offence at all and I will come to that point later and deal with it separately and prove that it is no offence at all—is said to have been committed by me. Therefore, I submit that we cannot proceed one step further with regard to this resolution and ask the Members of this House to vote separately on the propriety or impropriety, decency or indecency on the part of the offender in question. The Leader of the House must, in fairness, admit that this House has got a separate existence under the Constitution. He must examine the provisions of the Constitution and see what powers this House possesses, and what powers this House can exercise in matters of this nature. You can discharge your duties as Chairman of the House and do certain things only according to the Articles of the Constitution relating to this House. Sir, you cannot put into this House a new life or a new power that does not exist and that will not be given under the Constitution. The Constitution has made a distinction between the Assembly and this Council. The Assembly is the

[Sri T. Prakasam]

[13th May 1952]

real governing body. All the Money Bills have first to be introduced in the Assembly and no Money Bill can be introduced by any one of the Members or any one of the Ministers in this House. It will thus be seen that even under the Constitution, this House has been dealt with in an altogether different manner from the other House. Just as a man cannot be brought before a Court of Law for contempt of Court unless it is also a Court of Record, this matter relating to an offence said to have been committed by a Member before a Joint House cannot be brought before this House. This House has no power to consider the present motion. Such serious matters like, discipline, censure, etc., cannot be considered by this House unless it possesses the power of a Court of Record on judicial matters. Unless it is a Court of Record, no man can be taken before that Court on the ground that he has committed the offence of contempt of Court.

"In this connexion, I would like to refer to an occasion when I was myself subject to contempt proceedings. There was a Court presided over by a Judge of the High Court and two other gentlemen. All the three were conducting a case which related to contempt of Court alleged to have been committed by me as editor and proprietor of a newspaper.

3-45
P.M

"I was called upon at the instance of my esteemed friend, Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, to explain my conduct before a Court. He called the attention of the Court and said: 'Look here, by writing these matters in his paper *Swarajya* he has committed an act which amounts to contempt of Court'. He referred to the comments I wrote in my paper on the proceedings of the Court. Mr. Ramaswami Mudaliar is an old friend of mine and he asked me then why I should not be committed for contempt of Court. I received a notice to this effect and you know, Sir, what I wrote back on the back of the notice itself? I wrote, 'I refuse to appear before the Court'. The matter came up before the Court. Then, Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, who is now reputed for his statement in connexion with the Governor's Address and my walk-out, was the Advocate-General and the Judges of the Court asked him: 'Well, Mr. Prakasam has refused to appear before us; what have you got to say?' Honest man, that Mr. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri was, at that time (laughter), he gave the opinion: 'I am not prepared to say anything off-hand. I was not prepared for this point. Give me time'. A fortnight's time was given to him during which period he examined the papers, records and precedents. He finally found that I was right, came to the Court and said: 'Well, Mr. Prakasam is right in refusing to appear before this Court because it is not a Court of Record. It is only a Court of Record that can try a person for contempt of Court'. Therefore, Sir, this House should not be called upon to decide whether I have committed any offence or any irregularity in conduct. We must go into the very root of the matter and I hope the Leader of the House will realize the fact.

13th May 1952]

[Sri T. Prakasam]

“ He said, Sir, that it was his painful duty to move this Resolution. I say nothing of the sort. It is no painful duty either for him or for me. I am not afraid of this. Even if I am shot I am prepared. The Government have the power of shooting people. They have the power to shoot at sight. That is why the Communists have come on the top. That is why Mr. Adityan and I have come to occupy these benches here. In this country, free shooting was going on. If a man says he is a Communist, shoot him ’—that is the rule now.”

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—“ Shoot him in jail also.”

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ It is nothing if you are put in jail. But you cannot shoot any one. Many persons have been taken away from their homes. They have not returned to their homes yet. Their children and their families complained to me, as I was travelling in the train, about these matters.” (Interruption from the Treasury Bench.)

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ The accused is on trial. I do not think anyone can interrupt him while speaking.”

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—“ I am not on my trial. (Laughter.) I wish I could be on my trial. I wish I could be on trial—prosecuted and accused. There is nothing of the sort here. There he is and here I am. A point of jurisdiction I am raising before the House and I say that this House cannot be called upon to go into this motion. I hope my Friend, Mr. Rajagopalachari will not pursue this.”

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ This is not a Court of Honour.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to say a word about the point of order raised. If the Chairman after hearing me is in doubt and if he is willing to hear the opinions of other hon. Members here upon this subject before giving a ruling, then it is a different matter. The short point raised is a point of order and if I am permitted by Mr. Adityan without interruption to reply to that point, I would say . . . (Sri S. B. Adityan : ‘ This is not a Court of Honour.’) It looks as though this is a general debate and not a point of order. I am afraid, Sir, I should seek your help.”

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—“ May I interrupt, Sir? On this matter Mr. Adityan and other Friends who have studied these questions, want to place before you the position according to their light. The Leader of the House should not take advantage of a point of order and do all the speaking himself. Let everybody speak. Let everybody come forward to give evidence. There should be no objection.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I am entirely in the hands of the Chairman.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The Hon. the Leader of the House may now speak.”

[13th May 1952]

* SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—“ Is it that when the Leader of the House is on his legs nobody else should speak or question him? Only when the Chair is on its legs, none else can stand. If the Leader of the House also has the same right, we will not then interrupt him.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I have permitted him to speak and I do not want any hon. Member to interrupt the Hon. the Leader of the House.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The point which I have to answer before anything else is done is a point of order raised by an hon. Member that this House has no jurisdiction to take up this matter. The plausible case cited by Mr. Prakasam is this. He says that, as in a contempt case, the Court that treats a particular piece of conduct as contempt has jurisdiction to try that case and not any other Court here also, only before a joint assemblage of the two Houses of Legislature can I bring up this Motion. He said: ‘ The two Houses of Legislature were assembled together which the Governor was to address and the joint assemblage was to listen to that address. The substance of the Motion before the House is that something took place then which amounted to disorderly conduct, discourteous behaviour and the like and therefore that joint assembly alone has the right to listen to any story about it or any complaint about it and not this House.’ Sir, the point is a short and understandable one. The only question is whether it is right or wrong that so and so should have done so. I submit that the objection is misconceived for this reason. This House as well as the Legislative Assembly has the privileges of Parliament in this respect under Article 194 of the Constitution.”

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ This does not apply here.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Will you kindly let me proceed? The hon. Member wants to shut out others. He cannot interrupt always, and there must be decorum and a certain amount of order in the proceedings of this House. If the Chairman desires elucidation, he will certainly ask the hon. Member to speak. You will now see, Sir, that under Article 194 of the Constitution, this House as well as the Legislative Assembly—both the Houses of Legislature or either House of Legislature—has privileges which are well recognized as privileges in the Houses of Parliament, and breach of these privileges or any of these will be a subject matter for them to consider and take steps about. Each one of the Houses has that right. According to the Constitution, the two Houses that make up the Parliament, the House of the People and the Council of States, have individually the same rights. So also, the Council here and the Legislative Assembly here have—each one of them—the same rights and privileges, as the House of Commons in England, until they are defined by the Legislature by law.

13th May 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

“ The next question is whether the misconduct that we refer to in this Motion should be taken as falling under what may be described as a breach of privilege, and if so, whether it should be taken notice of by this House. Now, if any Member of this House does anything which amounts to misconduct—the question of fact is different and I am not going into the merits of it—and if he is found guilty of a breach of privilege, this House has full competence to protect itself by admonition or censure or otherwise by imposing a penalty on the Member”

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ For actions committed in this House.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ No, please. It is not at all so. It would be a kind of layman's law. What I wish to say is that every Member is bound to act in accordance with the decorum prescribed and therefore if any Member does anything which is not right and which amounts to a breach of privilege, this House has jurisdiction over that Member. As a matter of fact, the assemblage that was referred to does not constitute itself into a separate House. (Sri S. B. Adityan : ‘ It does.’) Please think along with me. But do not shout along with me. (Laughter.) There are two Houses assembled together for performing a particular function, namely, to listen to the Address of the Governor. Any misconduct anywhere, including that place, is misconduct and if it amounts to a breach of privilege, the particular House whose privilege has been violated is entitled to take it up. It has jurisdiction over one who is a Member of that House.

“ The question now is whether this misconduct should be limited to misconduct within the precincts of this House. I do not think that a breach of privilege is limited to misconduct within this House. Even if I commit a breach of privilege outside this House I am liable to answer for it here if I am a Member here. As a Member I am answerable to this House only. Therefore, Mr. Prakasam, who has acted in a particular manner (Interruption by Sri V. Chakkarai Chetty.) I am not appealing to you but to the Chair to rule out the point of order. I am not convincing you. This is a point of order, which I have to reply to.”

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—“ Why do you get angry ? ”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I am not angry at all. Neither do I hate you. (Laughter.) I am not by any means angry. But I do not wish to permit myself to be interrupted. That is not anger. I am submitting to the Chairman a very simple answer to a very simple point raised whether this House has jurisdiction to enquire into a breach of privilege committed elsewhere. They say this House has no right to admonish a Member, whereas I say that it is not a right view of the case. Article 194 confers certain privileges on this House in general terms. There is also mention about the privileges enjoyed

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[13th May 1952]

by the House of Commons which we also enjoy. This House has, therefore, a right to restore good conduct among its Members if any Member has misbehaved. This House has the right to call upon him to express regret and to admonish him. The misconduct may be here, it may be in the lobby, or it may be in the other House at a joint session. I go further and say that the two Houses were assembled together there and, therefore, any misconduct that took place—misconduct in the presence of the other Members including the Chairman of this House who was there along with the Members of the other House and its Speaker—should form a subject-matter of enquiry in the appropriate House. Therefore, there is no point whatsoever in the point of order raised.”

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ Sir, the Motion which has been brought up before the House is not one which can be discussed by us. That is my first point. You may call it a question of jurisdiction, or you may call it a question of competence. I have devoted some time in looking into similar cases and the authorities. Here is a Motion unprecedented in our history. Never before, in this State, never before in a Legislative Assembly, was such a Motion brought forward. The only recent case was the case of Mr. Mudgal against whom a Motion was brought forward in the Central Legislature for a breach of privilege. It is entirely different from the one before the House here. That was a case of bribery and corruption. Mr. Mudgal was charged with having received remuneration for duties which he ought not to have done as Member. There is no case either here or in England wherein a Member was hauled up for interruption or disorderly conduct. A Member of the House is different from a stranger and it is only a stranger that can be hauled up for interruption or disorderly conduct and not a Member.

4 p.m. “ Sir, the issue is simple. The speech of Mr. Prakasam in the Joint Session of the Legislature is alleged, on behalf of the Government, to be an act of discourtesy and constitutional impropriety. But, actually it was not so. It was an exercise of the constitutional and fundamental right of freedom of speech, and objection to it is sought to be brought in this unprecedented and unheard of way. In fact, it is a new weapon forged for the purpose of bringing pressure on the Opposition. But the charge is a very serious matter. In case this House finds him guilty, the punishment is admonition. The admonition is that the hon. Member, Mr. Prakasam, who is the seniormost Member, will be asked to stand in his seat and the Chairman will address him and administer an admonition and the Member will have to receive the admonition with bowed head. This is the procedure for any breach of privilege, followed in the House of Commons. Sir, this book (showing it to the House) was published by the Superintendent, Government Press, Government of Madras. It is surprising that the Hon. the Leader of the House has not seen this book.”

13th May 1952]

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ I have seen it.”

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ If he had seen this, then he was not following the procedure laid down therein. In this book, ‘ Note on the Privileges of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom ’ the punishment for the breach of privilege is—

‘ III. Breaches of privilege—(iv) Punishment inflicted on Members. . . . In many cases of breach, a reprimand or admonition by the Speaker, administered to the offending member standing in his place is deemed sufficient.,

Sir, to a politician, even if he is charged with murder, it will not be so serious as this. This charge, if proved, is a public shame and in a matter of serious charge as this, the Opposition is entitled to take all the advantages of the procedure and to insist that the procedure laid down by the rules of this House and by Law should be strictly enforced. There is no precedent in India for a case of breach of privilege and contempt in recent times except the Mudgal case, but there also it was for an offence of a different nature.

“ Then, Sir, on the point of jurisdiction, the speech complained of was made in the Joint Session. The speech was not made as a Member of this House, but as a Member of the Joint Session—and I will quote authorities soon. Our Constitution is different from the British Constitution. Under the British Constitution, it is only the House of Lords which sits in session when there is King’s Address. The Members of the House of Commons and the Speaker are merely asked to go to the House of Lords to listen. It is not a Joint Sitting. Whereas in our Constitution, there are three different entities, the Legislative Assembly, the Legislative Council and the Legislature, that is, the Joint Session comprising the Members of both the Houses. Article 176 (1) reads—

‘ 176 (1) At the commencement of the first session after each general election to the Legislative Assembly and at the commencement of the first session of each year, the Governor shall address the Legislative Assembly or, in the case of a State having a Legislative Council, both Houses assembled together and inform the Legislature of the causes of its summons.’

In this motion it is sought to be made out as though the hon. Members are being called merely for the purpose of listening, as though it is not a sitting, as though it is not a separate entity by itself and as though the Members assembled are not there to regulate the procedure and control the proceedings. The wording is clear, ‘ both Houses assembled together.’ It is not as though the Members in their individual capacity are being called for the purpose of listening to the Address of His Excellency the Governor. It is a sitting. Sir, in the actual wording of the motion before the House, the word ‘ listening ’ is very cunningly put. It is made to appear as though the individual Members are assembled only to *listen* as in the case of the House of Commons. But, here in this State, it is a sitting and the joint session is entitled to

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[13th May 1952]

control its proceedings. Here, the rules regulate the procedure of the House. Article 176 (2) reads—

‘ 176 (2) Provision shall be made by the rules regulating the procedure of the House or either House for the allotment of time for discussion of the matters referred to in such address. ’

Then, Sir, Rule 4 of the Madras Council Rules says :

‘ 4 (1) On the day appointed by the Governor for the commencement and holding of a session of the Legislature (not being a new Legislature) and in case of a new Legislature at the first sitting of the Legislature. . . ’

Therefore, Sir, the Members are attending the Joint Session not merely for listening, but to sit and conduct ‘ a sitting ’.

‘ Therefore, Sir, my submission is that the control of the procedure is vested in the Joint House. It may be that the correct procedure is that the Joint House should elect a President, but that was not done, and my opinion is that ought to have been done. Anyway, the control of the debate is vested in the hon. Members of the Assembly and the Council, in a Joint Session. We have got to remember that, so far as the Assembly is concerned, all the Members are elected and they are more numerous. It is very wrong for us sitting in the Legislative Council consisting as we do, of Members who have come through indirect elections and through nomination, to consider this question. This House is not competent to question what was done by that larger body.

‘ Sir, what is to-day complained of was done in the presence of the Leader of the House. What is it that prevented the Hon. the Chief Minister from raising an objection there? What prevented the other Hon. Ministers who were assembled there, from raising their voices of protest if they found anything disorderly? Even His Excellency the Governor did not raise any objection. What were the 375 Members doing? The speech in question was permitted by them all. In fact, if my information is correct, certain chits were passed in which the Governor mentioned that it might be permitted. I am asking, Sir, who are we to haul up an hon. Member here for what he said in the Joint Session? Supposing for the moment we administer an admonition to the hon. Member finding him guilty of the charge which has been brought before the House and supposing in the next Joint Session which is going to be held in June, a Member in that Joint Session brings in a motion for the breach of privilege and contempt of that larger House, saying, ‘ here is a Member of this Joint Session who exercised his right of freedom of speech by delivering a speech in the Joint Session and who has been found fault with and hauled up in the Upper House for the exercise of his rights in the Joint Session ’, what answer could we give? Will it not be a breach of privilege of the Joint House for us here to question the freedom of speech expressed in the other House? As a Joint Session, that body has its own privileges, and control and conduct of proceedings.

‘ Sir, there is one other very strong reason why this House has no jurisdiction. We have our own rules which have been framed long ago and which regulate the conduct of the Members

13th May 1952] [Sri S. B. Adityan]

of this House. A certain procedure is definitely laid down in our rules which by implication excludes other procedures. Rule 70 says—

'The Chairman shall preserve order and have all powers necessary for the purpose of enforcing the rules and preventing disorder.'

There are definite rules for every House. In this connection, I may be permitted to mention the Madurai Municipal Council case wherein the High Court delivered judgment only last week that the rules obtaining there should be strictly and literally followed, and there is no other way of taking disciplinary action against a Member.

"Sir, here we have got a definite rule. Rule 72 of the Madras Council Rules says— 4-15 p.m

'The Chairman may direct any member whose conduct is in his opinion grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the House, and any member so ordered to withdraw shall do so forthwith and absent himself during the remainder of the day's meeting. If any member is ordered to withdraw a second time in the same session, the Chairman may direct the member to absent himself from the meetings of the Council for any period not longer than the remainder of the session, and the member so directed shall absent himself accordingly. If such member refuses to withdraw, the Chairman may order his removal by force.'

The procedure laid down by the rule is as follows: First of all, the Chairman draws the attention of the House to the conduct of a Member. Secondly, after having called the attention of the House to the conduct of the Member, he directs the Member to withdraw from the House. Thirdly, if that Member is ordered to withdraw a second time in the same session, the Chairman directs the Member to absent himself from the meetings of the Council . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"What has this rule to do with the motion before the House?"

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—"Having a definite set of rules for the conduct of our business, it is not for us to go beyond those rules and apply another set of rules applicable to the House of Commons. We have got these fixed, definite rules which have been in force for a considerable time.

"It has been definitely held that the House cannot enlarge its privileges through a resolution of this House. In this connection, I should like to invite the attention of the House to the useful hand-book, 'Note on the Privileges of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom' published by the Superintendent, Government Press, Madras. On page 1 of that Hand-book, you will see that this principle is laid down, viz., that the privileges of the House cannot be enlarged by any resolution or motion brought by the Hon. Leader of the House before this House. It says—

'In 1704 at a joint conference of the Lords and Commons it was resolved, "That neither House of Parliament has any power by any vote or declaration to create to themselves new privileges not warranted by the known laws and customs of Parliament".'

[Sri S. B. Adityan]

[13th May 1952]

What are the known laws and customs of this House, we know. Then it says—

‘In practice the House insists upon no more than the bare minimum of its rights necessary to uphold its proper dignity and efficiency.’

“Sir, reference was also made to Article 194 of the Constitution in support of enlarging the powers of this House. I request you to read a little more carefully and you will see that it provides only for cases which will not be covered by the rules. Article 194 (1) says—

‘Subject to the provisions of this Constitution and to the rules and standing orders regulating the procedure of the Legislature, there shall be freedom of speech in the Legislature of every State.’

So, there shall be freedom of speech in the Legislature. It does not mean the Legislative Assembly. It does not mean the Legislative Council. It means that even in the ‘Legislature’ which means the joint session of both Houses, there shall be freedom of speech. You cannot go out of the Constitution. And you cannot go outside the rules, and standing orders regulating the procedure. The Article says, there shall be freedom of speech. Therefore, you cannot import the custom and procedure of the House of Commons. What does Article 194 (3) say? It says—

‘In other respects the powers, privileges and immunities of a House of the Legislature of a State and of the members and the committees of a House of such Legislature, shall be such as may from time to time be defined by Legislature by law, and until so defined.’

Even this is a temporary provision. So, my submission is that we are governed by a definite set of rules regarding all disciplinary proceedings. Sir, our leader, Mr. Prakasam, has been accused of a very grave charge and we claim and we are bound to insist, that the procedure of this House must be strictly followed and if there is loophole in the procedure, the benefit should be given to Mr. Prakasam. Article 194 (1) and (3) will apply only in cases where there are no definite set of rules. You cannot go outside these rules and the kind of privilege which has been claimed in the motion does not exist. It is entirely out of the jurisdiction of this Honourable House to go and enquire as to what happened in the joint session of the Legislature which, as I told you already, is a separate entity. So, I consider this motion is out of order.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“I do not want any more speeches on the point of order. Let me give my ruling on the point of order. The position appears to me to be perfectly clear. The motion refers to the conduct of a Member of this House at the joint session of the two Houses. According to the Rules, this House is competent to take note of the same. Now, it is only for the House to decide whether the hon. Member committed a breach of privilege of the House or not and whether disorderly conduct was committed by the hon. Member.”

SRI V. GURUNANDAN ROW :—“On a point of order,
Sir . . .”

13th May 1952]

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, when I began to speak, I was interrupted by Sri T. Prakasam on a point of order. Then I had only just read the motion. If the point of order is first settled and I am to proceed, I have to support the motion. If, of course, any other point of order is raised, it becomes a different matter and I will not object to it. Since the discussion began and is going on in a desultory way, I only want to make it clear that I have not yet supported the motion.”

* SRI V. GURUNANDAN ROW :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, the motion before the House is out of order because this House has no jurisdiction to enforce any breach of its privileges. Sir, the history of privileges of the Parliament in England has arisen out of what is known as the ‘ High Court of Parliament ’. Parliament exercised certain rights which courts exercised and as a matter of fact, contempt proceedings of the High Court of Parliament are similar to the contempt proceedings of courts. As far as our own House is concerned, Article 194 (3) of the Constitution provides for the privileges of this House. Article 194 (3) says—

‘ In other respects, the powers, privileges and immunities of a House of the Legislature of State, and of the members and the committees of a House of such Legislature shall be such as may from time to time be defined, by the Legislature by law and until so defined, shall be those of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and of its members and committees, at the commencement of this Constitution.’

Sir, apart from these rules and privileges, there are Fundamental Rights granted to the citizens of India. Certain procedure has to be followed before any action can be taken against any offender. In England, for the contempt of the House, the Speaker can send a person to jail. But can you do so here? Also, there is the question whether the Fundamental Rights granted under Articles 21 and 22 (1) will not be contravened. In this connection, I should like to invite your attention to the pamphlet ‘ Note on the Privileges of the House of Commons of the Parliament of the United Kingdom ’ published by the Superintendent, Government Press. At page 12, the note says—

‘ Article 194 (3) seems to be defective inasmuch as it does not lay down any sanctions or punishments or procedure for dealing with the offenders. In the absence of such sanctions the power conferred by the clause seems to be more imaginary than real. In the House of Commons, different ways of dealing with different breaches of privilege are laid down by long established custom and tradition.’

So, unless a law is made defining the privileges of the House there is no sanction behind the decision of this House. Mr. Chairman, you might have heard of the case of Mr. Mistry, Deputy Editor of the ‘ Blitz ’, where the difficulty arose as to how the sanctions for the breach of privilege could be actually enforced. It was not only because the contempt was outside the jurisdiction of the State (Uttar Pradesh) but it was also because it became impossible

[Sri V. Gurunandan Row] [13th May 1952]

to follow the exact procedure of the House of Commons which says that an offender should be put in the Tower and I understand they wanted to have a Tower built in Uttar Pradesh."

* SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—They want to build a cage!"

* SRI V. GURUNANDAN ROW :—" I think that unless a law is made defining the privileges of each House, this House has no jurisdiction to pass any punishment at all on any person because it does not have sanction.

4-30
p.m.

" There is no procedure. A person is being punished without observing any procedure at all. Is there any provision made for a person who has been called to defend himself to examine witnesses or has he got any other rights of an accused person? Therefore, Sir, unless a provision which complies with the Fundamental Rights is there, no action under privileges can be taken. This is my submission on this point."

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY :—" Sir, I wish to raise a very strong point. A good deal has been said by the Leader of the House regarding his freedom from hatred. I want to reciprocate that statement. I too do not want to hate him. We all love him as far as human nature is capable of doing. Apart from that, Sir, I wish to ask this question. On 6th May 1952, at a joint meeting of both Houses something is supposed to have happened. I do not know what really happened. Because you are calling up Mr. Prakasam to answer a charge, your charge must be authenticated by evidence as to what really happened on that occasion. He is supposed to have made a speech. Have we got a copy of the speech before us so that we may examine for ourselves in the context in which that speech was made, whether that speech was an infringement of the privileges of this House, and whether there was anything improper or indecorous in the speech that he made on that occasion? All these are suppositions which the Leader of the House wants us to make in order to facilitate him to pass this vote of censure. This is altogether unprecedented. As my Friend, Sri V. Gurunandan Row, pointed out there is no procedure that has been laid down so far as this legislature is concerned regarding inquiry into the conduct of any person who is supposed to have committed a breach of the privilege of the House. I was simply astonished when the Leader of the House said he will take cognizance of anything that may be done even outside the precincts of this House. Supposing a Member of this House beat his wife. It is altogether a bad thing, although many people indulge in that pastime. Do you mean to say, Sir, the Leader of the House will come forward with a motion to censure the conduct of that Member as being unworthy of a Member of this Honourable Legislature. Sir, my point is this that we have no materials on which to come to any judgment. I can give you, Sir, my own version of what happened on that occasion. On

13th May 1952] [Sri V. Chakkarai Chetty]

that occasion, there was no interruption of the speech of the Governor. My Friend, the Leader of the United Democratic Front, rose up—indeed you must not forget that he rose up—and said, ‘On a point of order, I wish to draw Your Excellency’s attention to this’ We must know all that really took place. The Governor sat down. If the Governor really thought that it was an unseemly conduct, he could have asked Mr. Prakasam to sit down. From the way in which the Governor sat down, I came to the conclusion that he wanted to hear Mr. Prakasam’s point of order. It seemed to me to be quite a legitimate thing for Mr. Prakasam or any other Member to have drawn the attention of His Excellency to something very important that he wanted to say.

“Sir, before I sit down, I hope you will permit me to put one more question. Supposing you invite me to your house just as the Governor invited all of us to the joint session of the Legislature and supposing I wanted to make up my mind to go away from your house for some reason or other, do you not think it would be consistent with my duty to you and my respect for you that I should explain why I am leaving you? Would it be really honourable on my part if, instead of doing so, I turned my back upon you and went away? So, my Friend, Sri Prakasam, got up on a point of order and said, ‘This is the reason why I am leaving the House followed by the Members of the United Democratic Front.’ Taking all these circumstances into consideration, it does not seem to me that this House has the right to go into a matter like this without having all the facts before it, and without taking all the circumstances into consideration. There is no procedure and there is nothing except that resolution of the Leader of the House and what he is going to say from his own imagination. He is indebted for many of his facts to his imagination which is a very fertile one. Therefore, Sir, I impress upon this House that it has a great duty to perform and if you are going to censure the Leader of a great party in this City and in this State, we will be placing ourselves open to ridicule. We cannot summon the public for contempt of the privileges of the House. If meetings are held all over the State condemning the action of the Leader of the House, then the Leader of the House cannot summon all these lakhs of people that might assemble at these places. I appeal to this House and the Leader of the House to ponder over these facts and not to rush to conclusions in order to vindicate, not the dignity of the Governor, but to vindicate his own dignity and the unfortunate position in which he and his friends have been placed.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“I have listened to the further point of order and I do not see any reason which would make me change the ruling I have already given. This House is competent to deal with this matter. I now call upon the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari to speak.”

[13th May 1952]

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ Sir, I do not question your ruling that this House has jurisdiction but I wish to submit a further point of order, viz., that this motion as brought forward is out of order, for another entirely different reason, in that it may lie against a stranger and not against a Member. I will now quote authorities in support of this.”

THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMY NAIDU :—“ Sir, on a point of order, I would submit that Sri Adityan has already raised a point of order in which he should have mentioned all his objections. I do not think it is open to him to raise a further point of order after the Chair has given its ruling.”

SRI M. P. GOVINDA MENON :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order, can a person who is not a Member of this House interfere in this discussion about the privilege of this House? ” (Laughter.)

* SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ Sir, this is not a matter to be laughed at, but a very serious matter and I ask you, Sir, to pay concentrated attention to this. My submission is that such a Motion can be brought only against a stranger and not against a Member of this Honourable House.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The Motion before the House relates to the conduct of a particular Member at a joint session of the Legislature and I have given my ruling that this House is perfectly competent to deal with this. There is no further argument about it except for the Hon. Sri C. Rajagopalachari to move his resolution.”

SRI S. B. ADITYAN AND SRI M. P. GOVINDA MENON :—“ Does it mean, Sir, that we cannot for ever raise any more points of order? ” (Cries of ‘ order, order ’.)

SRI N. ANNAMALAI PILLAI :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, on a point of order. இதற்கு எதாவது முடிவு உண்டா இல்லை யா? ஒரே ஆள் மூன்று, நான்கு தடவைகள் point of order ஐ எழுப்பிக்கொண்டே இருந்தால் இந்த சபை நடக்கிறதா இல்லையா? அதனால் அனாவசியமாக காலம் வீணாகிறது. இவர்கள் பேசுகிறதைக் கேட்பதற்கு நான்கள் இங்கே உட்கார்ந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறோம்? இங்கு நடக்கும் நடவடிக்கைகளில் கலந்துக்கொள்ளத்தான் நான்கள் வந்திருக்கிறோம்.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I have given my final decision. There will be no further point of order. The Hon. Leader of the House will now move his motion.”

* SRI B. V. SUBRAHMANYAM :—“ Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to raise a point of order which has not been raised by any other hon. Member, and which goes to the root of the matter. I request you, Sir, not to rule it out of order, as each one of the rulings given by you applies to the particular point of order raised and not to all points of order irrespective of their having been raised or not, and whatever they might be. If you are not going to allow it, Sir, I say it deliberately, you are gagging our mouths.”

13th May 1952] [Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam]

You, Sir, holding the privileges of the House in your hands, cannot forejudge what points of order can be raised by other persons, because I have been waiting to raise my point of order, for the last twenty minutes. Probably, my friends have forestalled me in catching your eye but that does not mean that the rulings with respect to their points of order cover the point of order which I am raising and I wish that you, Sir, as Chairman should not say that future points of order are also ruled out in this manner. There is no provision in the Rules to rule out any point of order. The hon. Members of this House can raise a point of order at any stage. Once a point of order has been raised, it is for you to consider whether there is any substance in it. Without hearing a point of order, I submit, it would be the barest act of injustice to democracy to say that we should not open our mouths even in this House. Therefore, Sir, I request you very respectfully to hear all those who have got points of order to raise whatever those points of order may be. If they are irrelevant or if they are meaningless and merely meant to waste the time of the House, I certainly agree that you, as Chairman, can say they need not be gone into."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The hon. Member has taken more than ten minutes to say what could have been said in 5 seconds."

SRI B. V. SUBRAHMANYAM :—" Sir, I have not taken more than two minutes."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The hon. Member will please sit down when I am speaking. One, two and more than three points of order have been raised and I have given my ruling on these points of order. We cannot go on raising points of order the whole day. The hon. Member has not caught my eye and I have given my final ruling and there is nothing more to add to that. There will be no more points of order."

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" No more points of order now and for ever? "

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" There should be a certain amount of decorum and decency in this House and the hon. Member, Sri S. B. Adityan, should not interrupt me when I am speaking. I have given my ruling and that is final. I did not say the ruling is for ever. I have got the business of the House to be carried on and the ruling will be given effect to."

SRI T. PRAKASAM :—" My hon. Friend, Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam, has got a new point of order to place before you. Do you say, Sir, that you refuse to hear him? "

* SRI B. V. SUBRAHMANYAM :—" Sir, I did not want to say anything in respect of the points of order raised by the others and that is why I did not get up. It should be understood, Sir, that I did not know, that even if I did not intend to talk on another Member's point of order, I should rise and try to catch

[Sri B. V. Subrahmanyam] [13th May 1952]

your eye in order to raise my own point of order. If you, Sir, gag me out, and I cannot raise my point of order I shall have to submit to your decision respectfully. I am in your hands.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The business of the House must go on.”

4-45 P.M. * THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, after all that has happened, although they were called points of order, there was a considerable amount of discussion on the merits also. In fact an appeal was made by one of the speakers, speaking on a point of order, that a senior Member of the rank and status of Sri Prakasam should not be put through this kind of Motion or trial, if I may so call it. The point is very simple. We have jurisdiction, first and primarily, over our Members and also in respect of certain matters concerning outsiders. The jurisdiction over our own Members is comprehensive wherever the conduct that we complain about is in derogation of the prestige or the authority of the House. In respect of others, certain other things have to be proved. So far as Members are concerned, if a Member misbehaves at a meeting, that behaviour must be dealt with under the ordinary rules, but where we have to deal with the conduct of a Member at a time and at a place when the two Houses assemble together under Article 176 of the Constitution, it is not treated as a separate House but it is an assembly of the two Houses together sitting for a particular purpose. Mr. Adityan was arguing—now I am not referring to the point of order raised by him”

(At this stage Sri M. P. Govinda Menon was seen raising from his seat.)

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Govinda Menon, I know a certain amount of procedure, though I am not as clever as you are. The point that was raised was that the behaviour of a Member at that place should be adjudged by some authority at that meeting and by no other authority. That was not only a point of order but also a point of merit. The question that I am addressing myself to is that the Constitution does not provide for a third House constituted by a joint sitting. There is a provision for that with regard to the Parliament at Delhi but so far as this Legislature is concerned, there is no provision for any joint sitting. The two Houses are two Houses only. When there is a difference of opinion, there is a special procedure prescribed and there is no question of a joint sitting. The only time when the two Houses assemble together is under Article 176 of the Constitution and under that Article the two Houses sit together in order to fulfil a particular function. There is no question of a third House having been created and all privileges and other procedures in respect of that third House, being governed by a different set of principles and rules. Therefore we are concerned with the misconduct of one of the Members of

13th May 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

our House in respect of a matter in which we are interested, and deeply interested. We had assembled at the joint sitting in order to listen to the Governor's Address and we had to be on our behaviour—every one of us—and instead of that, we observed there was interruption. It is not the subject-matter of the speech that we are concerned with so much as the interruption itself. The interruption was there and the interruption was not by chance or provoked by a casual incident, or in excitement, or something of that kind. But it was deliberate interruption followed by deliberate walk-out, when that interruption was not accepted as lawful or as legal by the Governor. In fact, when the thing was finished the gentleman who made the interruption followed by others did not even sit down but walked out. The main point to be considered is whether that interruption is a matter which may be overlooked. If it had been even a case of interruption or mis-conduct of a kind which could be overlooked without detriment to the future work of the House and without detriment to our prestige and without detriment to the dignity of the House, I would not, Sir, have brought this Motion. It is because I feel that it is a bad precedent that I think it must be set down as wrong. It is because of that I consider it necessary—as I described it a painful duty—to bring this motion. The question as to what should be done for the offence is covered by the Motion itself. The Motion is that we should hold our opinion and express that opinion. That expression itself will be the admonition of the Member concerned. All that I genuinely want is that this incident should not be treated as a precedent, that when we meet together under the Constitution, with the Head of the State giving the programme of the Government through an Address it should not be an occasion for debate or wrangle or interruption. I, therefore, wish to appeal to the House to accept the Motion.

“As regards the gravity of the conduct in question, hon. Members have referred vaguely to the unfortunate fact that it is a very senior Member who is concerned in the matter. I wish to point out that misconduct by a new Member or by a junior Member is not of much importance, but if the interruption is wrong, then the more senior a Member the greater should be the attention directed to that matter. If a Junior Member reads out a long manuscript speech, the Chairman or the Speaker does not interrupt him. Supposing a senior Member does it, the Chairman or the Speaker intervenes. Here, it is a clear case of interruption and misconduct, and I submit with all respect to my friend, Mr. Prakasam, that there is no question of *mala fides* in the matter, or that we are led away by our political opinions. There is no doubt whatsoever that when we have a political plan we are often misled into error in support of it. But that error would not matter if it did not lay down precedents for future errors by others. Here the idea is that a particular Government which was called upon to take over charge should not take over charge. I am quite sure that

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [13th May 1952]

Mr. Prakasam thinks genuinely that I should not have been called upon by the Governor, that I should not have formed the Ministry and that the Governor should not have accepted my Ministry as the Government and therefore the Address should not be read. I have no doubt, he was sincerely convinced that his interruption was just, good and right on merits. But the question before us is whether it can be passed as legitimate or constitutional or proper. It is only when we are convinced that a certain thing is necessary and that happens to be a political step, we lose our judgment and we are sometimes misled into errors. That is the genesis of this action. It is no justification. Surely Mr. Prakasam is not one who would have indulged in such a thing if he had not been convinced that it was the right thing to do. That is the very reason why we should mark our disapproval of that act. I shall not say more about the facts. The facts are known as the whole incident occurred in the open House. You, Mr. Chairman, were present. The entire House was present on the occasion and I am not referring to anything that happened outside. All people knew about the interruption, the manner of the interruption, the time of the interruption, the context of interruption and the manner in which Sri Prakasam spoke, namely 'Since you think you are competent to address and I do not think so, and you do not accept my argument that you are incompetent, I walk out with my friends.' That is the incident which happened at that time before everybody. And apart from other people we were all present there. It would be a waste of time for me to go into the facts. I submit it was highly improper conduct and we should mark our disapprobation by adopting this motion. Sir, I move the motion standing in my name."

The Hon. Sri K. Venkataswamy Naidu seconded the motion.

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—" I wish to know whether the Hon. Chief Minister can cite one instance of a Member being hauled up for interruption and disorderly conduct and whether such a motion is not applicable only to strangers and not to Members? "

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" My hon. Friend, Sri Adityan, was saying that this was the first time such a Motion was being brought in. I am very sorry to have to answer in his own language. This is the first time that a man of Mr. Prakasam's position and seniority has chosen to interrupt on an occasion of that kind. Since the event has happened for the first time, notice of it also is taken for the first time.

" Mr. Adityan asks whether the House has ever exercised its jurisdiction over its Members and not over outsiders only. The most recent case which the hon. Member should have known is Mr. Mudgal's case in Parliament. It was disposed of by that House. The offence might differ and the nature of misconduct might differ. But the question before the House is the same. There is nothing wrong and everything is right, in the House

13th May 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

exercising its jurisdiction first over its Members before proceeding against outsiders. The question is, whether the conduct of the Member was right or wrong. That depends on and is answered by the plain facts."

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—"Sir, The Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari has put the case very briefly. His complaint is that I got up at the joint sitting and addressed the Governor and that is wrong. Sir, I am very glad, he has admitted or he has stated that no further enquiry need be made in this matter. Since you, Sir, are new to your place and I am also new to my place in the Opposition, I wish to explain certain matters.

"This morning before I came here, there was a call on the telephone. The person at the other end said that it was 'Mr. Rajagopalachari speaking.' Well Sir, what did he say? He asked me, 'Are you attending the Council to-day?' The same question was repeated thrice by the person at the other end of the phone. I said, 'Yes, I am attending the Council positively.' Then the person at the other end told me 'They are going to expel you; are you going to attend the House still?' I told him, 'Certainly I am going to attend the House and face that music also, my friend, don't worry.' At first I thought that it was really Mr. Rajagopalachari who had spoken to me, but then I had a suspicion because the voice was not exactly like that of Mr. Rajagopalachari. So, as soon as I came here, I asked him, 'Did you call me on the phone this morning?' He said, 'No'. I am giving this incident for the amusement of all the Members and visitors of this House. I want to know who was that man that called me on the phone and asked me three times the question whether I am attending the House. I must only appeal to the authorities if there are any in this land, to find out who that man is."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Are you satisfied that it was not I who spoke?"

SRI T. PRAKASAM:—"I am perfectly satisfied that it was not you.

"As regards the charge, I am sorry, it was considered proper and necessary that a resolution of this kind should be placed before this House. The resolution was communicated to me saying that I will have to reply to it this day—13th of May. I do not know what is there for trial before the House now? Mr. Rajagopalachari has set out the case for the resolution. I am here in flesh and blood to say what I have to say in the matter. I say, I am the man who stood up in the joint sitting before the Governor and made the speech. There is no complaint so far as the speech is concerned. I made the speech on a point of order. To consider why I had to make that speech, we must take into account all that has happened in this State during the last five years.

[Sri T. Prakasam]

[13th May 1952]

5 p.m.

" So far as Madras was concerned there was an order from the Congress High Command that I should not move any resolution, before the Assembly over which Sri Sivasanmugam Pillai was presiding, regarding the conduct of the then Ministers. I refused to obey that order. Then there was an order from the so-called High Command of the Congress that I should not make any speech on my charges against the Ministers. I refused to obey that order also, because it involved the fundamental rights conceded not to Mr. Prakasam, or any legislator or any particular person, but to the people of India as a whole. In the Preamble to the Constitution—I was also a member engaged in drafting that Constitution—we changed the name of King George and we stated in clear language that the people of India shall be the rulers of India from to-day onwards. It is in accordance with that dictum we have to conduct ourselves.

" I need not be told what to do on matters of decorum and decency. Unless I had been properly advised and was quite certain that I was perfectly justified in doing so, I would not have got up to speak while His Excellency rose to deliver his address. I got up and spoke what I had to speak. You, Mr. Chairman, have not become used to rules and precedents in the House of Commons, House of Lords and even this House also. You may in course of time get used to all these things. You have got to hear all sides. I am not arguing. I am not quoting anything in support of what I have done. My conduct is one that would be perfectly justifiable having regard to the circumstances in which we had been placed and conditions obtaining in the State during the last five years.

" My hon. Friend, Sri C. Rajagopalachari has said something about decency and decorum in connection with my rising and interrupting the Governor while he rose to deliver the Address. I told the Governor that I was rising on a point of order. The Governor after hearing me sat down in his chair and allowed me to complete what I wanted to say. Why did the Governor do like that? My friend should examine that point. He has to examine our previous history. We have been the subject race of Great Britain for nearly 200 years. We have copied the Constitution of Great Britain. Even in this Constitution of ours allow me to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that I am not very proud of it—which we have framed after three years labour, we have copied bodily the Constitution of 1935. While the Constitution was being framed I had to struggle on the floor of that House with the President of that Assembly who was in charge of framing the Constitution. I asked him whether it was for the benefit of the people of India or the people of Great Britain that we were framing this Constitution. 'Are we to be governed by our own people or are we to be governed by the British', I asked. Then there was a change made in the Preamble to the Constitution.

" Apart from all these, why did I rise to make my speech while the Governor was addressing? I wanted to rise on a point of

13th May 1952] [Sri T. Prakasam]

order, because I wanted to place before the very eyes of the Governor certain facts. I did this knowing fully well that I was perfectly right in doing so.

“ Sir, I think I have made my points very clear.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ Am I to take it that hon. Members want to sit till 6 o'clock to finish off the agenda? ”

SRI S. B. ADITYAN :—“ Sir, under rule 21 of the ‘ Rules of Procedure of the Madras Legislative Council ’ it has been our convention that discussion, if at all should be continued after 5 p.m. should be proceeded with only if there is agreement on both sides. Now we are completely washed out and I request that we may continue our discussion tomorrow.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I now adjourn the House to meet again at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.”

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, the 14th May 1952.

VL.—PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

Amendment to the Malabar Tenancy Rules, 1951.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

